

Concordia

Theological Monthly

Vol. X

APRIL, 1939

No. 4

The Means of Grace in Roman Theology

That things are not what they seem is an observation elicited frequently by a course of study in Roman Catholic dogma. At no point is this caution more necessary than in an attempt to comprehend the Roman Catholic idea of Grace and of the Means of Grace.

When the Lutheran Reformation eliminated that host of intermediaries and plenipotentiaries who obstructed the way to grace, it incredibly simplified certain fundamental concepts. Grace is the attitude of divine good will toward the sinner, nothing else. And the Means of Grace are the provisions which God has made to bring His favor to the individual. Fundamentally there is only one means, the Gospel-message. In its plural form the word would include the Sacraments, Baptism and Holy Communion, and such functions of the holy ministry as preaching and absolution.

The Roman handbooks list a bewildering array of topics under the head of Means of Grace. Francis Cassilly has written a textbook for use in Catholic high schools entitled *Religion, Doctrine, and Practice* (1926). Cassilly lists among the Means of Grace first of all Grace as Sanctifying and Actual, thereby advising us at once of a fundamental difference somewhere in the definition of grace, as distinguished from the Protestant concept. Among the Means of Grace there is listed next Prayer, with a special section on the "Hail Mary." Then the Sacraments. Then the sacramentals, such as the blessings of the Church, also holy water, the rosary, candles, crosses, and medals. Furthermore, religious ceremonies, genuflections, vestments, liturgy, processions, pilgrimages. Also the ecclesiastical year with its holy days, rogation days, the Corpus Christi, the devotion of the Sacred Heart, and the entire system of seasons and days, of which the author says that it unquestionably "could have come only from the inspiration of the Holy Ghost."

In all this variety of Means of Grace one is conspicuously absent — the Word.

Yet there is nothing haphazard or accidental about this classification of various functions, offices, institutions, and ceremonies as Means of Grace. The clue to the apparently heterogeneous scheme is found in the Roman Catholic definition of grace.

Grace

In Roman theology the term grace includes a number of religious ideas which are carefully defined in the handbooks of doctrine, however confusing may be their use in the literature of the Church generally. A large number of passages might readily be quoted in which the term grace is employed in its Scriptural sense. The grace of God is also to the Catholic God's forgiving love. So thoroughly is this concept of grace embedded in both the Old and the New Testament Scriptures that no theology which still has its fringe in the canonical writings can fail to employ the term in its native sense. Yet throughout the dogmatic and devotional literature of the Roman Church a constant shift in the meaning of the term grace is observed.

When the Protestant says that "without grace no one can enter heaven," he has in mind the pardoning love of God. When the Catholic teacher uses the same expression, he means "sanctifying grace" — that gift which Adam lost through the Fall, the gift "which had placed him in a supernatural state and made him a friend and child of God with a right and title to enter heaven."¹ The Roman theory assumes that, as Adam received a *donum superadditum* which made him pleasing to God, so every child of God may receive this "supernatural gift by which we are cleansed from sins, made holy, pleasing to God, and heirs of heaven." This gift is called "sanctifying grace," also "the grace of justification." "By it we are justified, that is, we pass from a state of sin to a holy and righteous state." Of this gift it is said that it is "a free gift of God and cannot be merited by naturally good works" — a limitation which makes confusion worse confounded because granting *some* merit to the works which are good, — though not *naturally* so. As a matter of fact, we are immediately informed that sanctifying grace "gives us a title to merit *by our good deeds*."² More specifically, sanctifying grace "is restored by acts of faith, hope, and contrition," and when a person is in such a state, the Council of Trent declares life eternal to be strictly merited. If then it is asked by what means such "grace" may be obtained, we are told that there are two principal means — prayer and the use of the Sacraments.

1) Cassilly, *op. cit.*, p. 145.

2) Cassilly, *op. cit.*, p. 147.

That which preserves this system from becoming the baldest Pelagianism is the doctrine that good works "derive their value from the merits of Jesus Christ."

As distinguished from sanctifying grace, there is actual grace. Cassilly illustrates this doctrine by means of a comparison, thus: "One wintry day a team of horses was laboring to pull a heavily laden wagon up an ice-covered hill. Finally it was stalled; it could go no farther. An auto truck happening by, the driver saw the predicament of the stalled team and came to its relief by attaching his truck to the wagon-pole. With the assistance of the truck the horses easily drew the load up the hill." Now, in this case the natural powers of man are the team of horses, the grace of God is the auto truck, and so man, "by the union of his natural powers with grace, is enabled to perform the virtuous act or overcome the temptation." "Actual," then, is a term implying activity, the ability of man to do good and avoid evil, differing from sanctifying grace (which is "permanent") in this, that, "when the temptation passes or the good act is performed, the grace is no longer needed, and it ceases." It is more proper therefore to speak of actual graces (plural), — and this is the common Catholic usage, — "graces, like gentle rain from heaven, are constantly falling into our souls," etc.³⁾

It is only with this preview of the Catholic concept of grace that we are able to understand the doctrine of the means by which grace is conferred. These, as has been said, range from the "Hail Mary" and holy candles to the tremendous mystery of the Mass. Yet there are two features which characterize the Roman concept of the Means of Grace in a manner peculiar to that system. We have in mind the doctrines of the *opus operatum* and of the indelible character in the sacramental system.

The Sacramental System

The Means of Grace, as the term is understood in Roman theology, is not primarily the Word, but the priestly function, more accurately still, that complex of priestly functions which we call the sacramental system.⁴⁾

Through the Sacraments, permanently instituted by Christ, the Roman church-member has the means by which, when rightly used, God is moved infallibly to confer grace upon the soul. But

3) The Catholic catechist will ask: "Are graces distributed equally? Why not? Did the great saints receive more graces than ordinary Christians? How do our graces depend on our own disposition? Do we always notice the graces we receive?" So Cassilly.

4) It should be noted that Gibbons ranks prayer above the Sacraments as a Means of Grace. *Faith of Our Fathers*, Ed. '92, p. 265. So the handbooks generally.

although the grace of God is equally present in all, they have each a specific effect and also differ in their ability to confer an indelible character. The theological handbooks endeavor to present, more or less successfully, this unity of purpose (with diversity of gift) by means of analogies from human life. Looking upon life as a conflict and the Church as the army at war with sin, Berthold of Chiemsee (*Tewtsche Theologye*, 1528) points out that man is enrolled in this army through Baptism; Confirmation gives him the armament; Penance binds up and heals those wounded in the strife; Communion gives food to the soldier; and Extreme Unction serves the dying. Holy Orders sends the servants into the Christian battle-line, and Marriage supplies ever new additions to the forces.

Other unifying principles have been suggested. It has been pointed out that the seven sacraments are each opposed to one of the seven deadly sins, thus: in Baptism, humility opposes pride; in Confirmation, hope is opposed to avarice; in the Eucharist, love against envy; in Penance, righteousness against gluttony; in Extreme Unction, endurance against sloth; in Ordination, wisdom against anger; in Marriage, continence against impurity.

Again, it has been reasoned that Baptism and Penance concern faith, Confirmation and Extreme Unction concern hope, Eucharist and Matrimony concern charity, while Ordination is the means of supplying all the rest.

More artificially still, the Catholic writers of works of devotion draw an analogy between the seven sacraments and the five loaves and two fishes, Matt. 14:17 ff. Five sacraments are incumbent on every Christian, "even as bread is the universal food," while the fishes correspond to Ordination and Matrimony, which are left to the individual choice, "even as sea-food is a matter of personal preference."

The artificial nature of these parallels and analogies is evident. While impressive and even convincing to rude minds, they are not featured in the modern handbooks of instruction. Francis Cassilly says, rather matter of fact:

"The number and nature of the sacraments correspond most aptly with the needs of the temporal and spiritual life. As men by their natural birth are brought into the world, so by Baptism they are born to the supernatural life of grace and brought into the Church. Children must grow and get strong, and Confirmation makes us strong and vigorous in grace. Men need food to nourish them, and the Eucharist is the food of the soul. When people fall ill, they need a remedy to bring them back to bodily health; Penance restores life and health to the soul. All must die, and Extreme Unction gives us consolation and special grace to die

in peace and resignation; and it does more, for it brings back the former vigor of the soul by removing the remains of sin and sometimes restores the bodily health. Nations must have a government and civil rulers; the Sacrament of Holy Orders supplies spiritual rulers to the Church and keeps up its administration. Marriage makes the family and perpetuates the human race, while the Sacrament of Matrimony makes the Christian family, perpetuates the Church on earth, and fills heaven with saints." ⁵⁾

But now as to the features which have been superimposed upon the sacramental system by the doctors of the Church—the *opus operatum* doctrine and the Indelible Character.⁶⁾

The Doctrine of Opus Operatum

Both the Augsburg Confession and the Apology have expressed the dissent of the Reformers from "those who teach that the Sacraments justify by the outward act and who do not teach that, in the use of the Sacraments, faith which believes that sins are forgiven is required" (*Augsb. Conf.*, Art. 13) and condemn "the whole crowd of scholastic doctors, who teach that the Sacraments confer grace *ex opere operato*, without a good disposition on the part of the one using them, provided he do not place a hindrance in the way." (*Apol. A. C.*, XIII, 18.) The argument by which Roman Catholic theology endeavors to establish the absolute efficacy of the Sacraments is one of the strangest combinations of Rationalism and of *argumentum ad hominem*, with an appeal to exegesis which ignores fundamental principles of interpretation. The argument as it is found in modern text-books of instruction goes back to the pre-Tridentine, when the apologists for the old system had to justify their doctrines against the criticism of Lutheran and the other reformers. The following is translated from the German (and an uncouth German it is) of John Mensing, whose *Antapology*, directed against the Augsburg Confession and its Apology ("*der kraftlosen vnd vngegründten Philipp Melancthonis Apologiae*") was completed in 1535:⁷⁾

"When our theologians compared the Sacraments of Holy Church with those of the Jews, they raised the question whether in Christ's Sacraments there be a native power (*eynige krafft*), to work forgiveness of sins, since it is clear from the Scriptures that

5) *Op. cit.*, p. 178.

6) Both doctrines are held also by the Eastern Church, likewise the teaching that for effective administration of the Sacraments the inward intention of the priest is necessary. (See *Popular Symbolics*, p. 143 f.)

7) The section is quoted in *Die Vortridentinisch-Katholische Theologie des Reformations-Zeitalters, aus den Quellen Dargestellt von Dr. Hugo Laemmer*. Berlin, 1858, p. 220 f.

the Jewish Sacraments did not have this power. Paul, Gal. 4:9, calls these weak and beggarly elements — beggarly because they lacked the sufferings of Christ, without which they were ineffective. And still the Scripture testifies that the fathers, when they used such Sacraments, received forgiveness. Now, our theologians maintain that this did not occur *ex opere operato*, or by the power and virtue of the action itself. Rather, they maintain that forgiveness was conferred by reason of the faith in Christ on the part of those who used them, called by our theologians *opus operans*. Now, say our theologians, if we are to attribute to the holy Sacraments more virtue and power than we attribute to the Jewish Sacraments, they must be capable of giving grace to those who subject themselves faithfully. And this, they say, is *ex opere operato*, that is, by the very use of the Sacrament, even if *opus operans* (that is, devotion and faith) are not present, so long as by an obstinate wicked heart and secret unbelief they do not make themselves unworthy of grace.

"The Sacraments of the Old Testament gave the grace of forgiveness merely as a reward of faith. If the New Testament Sacraments are to do more, they will give forgiveness by the simple action that is being performed. The reason for this is the Passion of Christ, which operates through them. Such a work cannot be without power. It is true that in Baptism my faith is *opus operans*; but Baptism in itself, and viewed in absence of my faith, is *opus operatum*, where Christ works without me, and the effect is justification, or forgiveness of sins. And so our theologians are steeled (*gesegenet* — lit., protected as by a charm) against every argument of the Lutherans and Anabaptists when they confess that in the Sacraments of Christ is an invisible power and grace which works justification and forgiveness of sin, renewal, the infusion of grace and every virtue, without addition of any work of ours, simply permitting the Holy Ghost to grant it *ex opere operato*."

The *ex-opere-operato* theory was established as official Catholic doctrine when the Council of Trent pronounced anathema upon any one "who would say that grace is not conferred *ex opere operato* through the Sacraments of the new law but maintain that faith in the divine promise is sufficient to obtain grace." (Sess. VII, Can. VIII.)

The Jesuit dogmatician Christian Pesch, in the sixth volume of his *Praelectiones Dogmaticae*, discusses the proposition that "the Sacraments of the new law confer sanctifying grace *ex opere operato*." He explains that by *opus operatum* is to be understood the very sacramental sign (as, for instance, the sprinkling of water upon the head of the candidate) together with the pronouncement of the words "I baptize thee," etc. "Hence," says Pesch, "the *opus*

operatum is opposed to the *opus operantis*, that is to say, opposed either to the merit of the minister or to that of the one receiving the Sacrament. Accordingly the meaning of the proposition is: "When a person receives the Sacrament in the prescribed manner, he receives sanctifying grace, not because himself or the minister deserve this grace, but by virtue of the sign instituted by Christ." ⁸⁾

The doctrine of the *opus operatum* was completely developed by Bellarmine, whose propositions again were analyzed and refuted by Gerhard. (*Loci, sub* "The Sacraments in General.") Bellarmine as well as the later dogmaticians ⁹⁾ have endeavored to cover up the mechanistic theory of the Sacraments involved in the *ex opere operato* by pointing out that, while the recipient and his faith have nothing to do with the efficacy of the Sacrament in conferring grace, the recipient, by his faith and repentance, supplies a fertile soil for the operations of divine grace. "As there must be in the wood a capacity of being set on fire if a flame is to be produced, even so there must be on the part of the recipient preparation and co-operation in order that the Sacrament might do its work" — a line of reasoning which adds to the inconsistencies in the doctrine of the Sacrament and, worst of all, makes the favorable, or receptive, attitude of the parishioner the true cause of that infusion of grace or accession of virtue which Roman theology has substituted for the free gift of divine pardon. John Perrone, S. J., in his *Praelectiones Theologicae*, ¹⁰⁾ seeks to show that Sacraments confer their grace by an "inner virtue," by adducing proof from the Scriptures, the fathers, and the unanimous teaching of the Church. All texts which establish the power of the Sacraments to confer grace are cited to prove that this power is exerted by the mere outward performance of the prescribed act. This has been consistently the method of proof ever since Catholic dogmaticians were compelled to justify their mechanical view of the Means of Grace after the foundation had been shaken by the first onslaught of the Reformers. ¹¹⁾

It adds to the confusion when Roman theology makes the

8) Pesch, *op. cit.*, 4th edition, 1914, Vol. 6, p. 46.

9) For instance W. Wilmers, *Lehrbuch der Religion*, 7th edition, 1912, IV, 218 f.

10) Ratisbon, 1856, Vol. II, p. 267 ff.

11) In the popular presentation little or nothing is made of the inherent power of the Sacrament, its efficacy *ex opere operato*, emphasis being laid on the need of proper disposition. For instance, in Cassilly both teachings are united in the sentence: "It is to be noted that the Sacraments, according to the institution of Christ, give grace of themselves and not by virtue of the minister or recipient, though the disposition of the recipient may be a necessary condition." (*Op. cit.*, p. 179.)

effectiveness of the Sacraments depend upon an entirely subjective factor, the purpose in the mind of the officiating priest. This is the famous doctrine of the Intention.

The Intention

On the one hand, the Roman Church teaches—and to this Protestant theology has never objected—that the validity of the Sacrament depends neither on the faith nor on the moral probity of the minister.¹²⁾ This does not mean, however, that, in order that the Sacraments may be administered *properly* (*licite*) the minister may be an unbeliever or living a reckless life of sin. On the contrary, one who is not in a state of grace, sins mortally if, knowing such a condition of his soul, he nevertheless administers a Sacrament. But this does not affect the *validity* of the sacred act. The theologians distinguish between an administration *licite* and *valide*. There is no *valid* administration unless there is present the intention of the priest.

Here the Aristotelian distinction between matter and form enters in. If the matter of Baptism is changed, there is no Sacrament, as when another liquid than water is used. Or the form is altered (and in this terminology, form is equivalent to essence), and here the intention of the speaker enters as a decisive factor. It is possible to use conventional words in a subjective manner, as when instead of intending that Baptism confer grace, the priest speaks with this intention: "I baptize thee—for the purpose of cooling thee off." The sacramental word can only then be effective when the intention to do what the Church does is present.¹³⁾ The dogmaticians develop with great ingenuity the exact meaning of intention. They distinguish it from mere attention, also from mental distraction, which may be a venial or even a mortal sin, but does not, like the absence of intention, affect the essence of a valid Sacrament.¹⁴⁾

The Scripture proof for the Intention is derived from 1 Cor. 4:1, Luke 22:19, and John 20:23.

The disquieting doubt of the Roman Christian whether his baptism had been valid and whether in the absence of such valid Baptism he be properly confirmed, married, ordained, is not overlooked by the dogmaticians. The handbook of Perrone refers to the circumstance, "*quod in Catholicorum doctrina necessario anxietas animi oriri debeat, num quis fuerit rite baptizatus, caeteraque sacramenta sibi rite fuerint collata.*" His answer is

12) *Valor sacramentorum neque a fide neque a probitate ministri pendet.* Pesch, *op. cit.*, p. 105.

13) Wilmers, *op. cit.*, p. 240 ff. So all the dogmaticians since Trent.

14) Pesch, *op. cit.*, p. 123 ff.

that there is a justifiable moral certainty that the rite is celebrated with the proper priestly intention; that is, the chances are infinitely against the occurrence of such a lapse.¹⁵⁾

It is difficult to follow the dogma in all its ramifications, as when Wilmers asserts that the *actual* intention is not necessary (though desirable), that the *habitual* is not sufficient, and that the *virtual* is required and is sufficient.¹⁶⁾ In the end, the Catholic doctrine of Intention defies all attempts at definition, since it is, on the one hand, made an absolute and sufficient condition of a valid rite, while, on the other hand, the Sacrament is held to be effective by its inner constitution (*ex opere operato*), yet with the condition, in the recipient, of preparation "by making fervent acts of faith, hope, love, desire, contrition, and humility."¹⁷⁾

The Indelible Character

The Council of Trent pronounced a curse on all who deny that in Baptism, Confirmation, and Ordination the soul receives a spiritual and indelible mark, or character. This accounts for the fact that these sacraments may not be repeated. The character is held to be indelible during the present life and in that which is to come, the latter indeed by an argument *e silentio* (because the councils do not limit the character to the present life).¹⁸⁾ As to the exact nature of this character, Catholic theology has no descriptions that go beyond adducing those texts which refer to the seal imprinted upon the believer, 2 Cor. 1:21, 22; Eph. 1:13; 4:30. The inadequacy of these texts was pointed out by Chemnitz in his *Examen*¹⁹⁾ and by Gerhard in his criticism of Bellarmine. Cassilly explains that Baptism, Confirmation, and Holy Orders "cannot be repeated because they imprint an indelible spiritual character, or mark, upon the soul. As a brand upon cattle shows

15) Perrone, *op. cit.*, p. 283.

16) Referring to the last-mentioned type of intention: "Wer mit einer solchen Meinung wirkt, verrichtet menschliche, das heisst, aus Ueberlegung und Freiheit hervorgehende, Handlungen, und eine solche Meinung ist in Wahrheit eine Einwirkung des Willens auf den sakramentalen Akt." (Wilmers, *op. cit.*, p. 243.)

17) Cassilly, *op. cit.*, p. 179. There is no space here to enter into attrition and contrition and the possibility of receiving the benefits of a Sacrament when in mortal sin without knowing it. Nor can we stop to analyze the strange dogma that a Sacrament can be received "validly but without obtaining grace." As when Cassilly defines: "One who receives Baptism, Confirmation, Extreme Unction, Holy Orders, or Matrimony unworthily receives them validly, that is, he is actually baptized, ordained, married, etc., though without obtaining any grace." (*Op. cit.*, p. 180.)

18) Wilmers, *op. cit.*, p. 271.

19) *Exam. Conc. Trid.*, p. 2, in can. 9, *De Sacramentis*.

who the owner is, this spiritual mark shows that the person belongs to Christ in a special manner. This character remains forever, even in the next life, where it will be a badge of joy and glory to the elect and of shame to the lost." And this is as far as the doctors go. They call the character a "supernatural quality of the soul by which man in a peculiar manner becomes conformed to Christ, the High Priest, is set aside for divine service, and receives a special relationship to grace." This is the definition of Pesch. It is not a physical potency but rather a moral power by which the individual is made capable of receiving or administering sacred things. Pesch finally dismisses the discussion of the character by designating it as a "*passibilis qualitas*." (!) Whether it be located in the essence of the soul or in its faculties, has also been disputed by the scholastics. Aquinas held that it was affixed to the intellect, Scotus found it in the will, while the Jesuit theologians referred it to the soul's essence. Pesch finds the solution in the opinion, held by many doctors, that there is no real distinction between the essence of the soul and its faculties!

And here we shall terminate our survey of that farrago of unprofitable, self-contradictory, man-made dogmas which the Church of Rome has substituted for the simple doctrine of the Means of Grace.

THEODORE GRAEBNER

Der Pastor als Synodalglied

Es gibt hier auf Erden eine wunderbare Gemeinschaft, so innig und intim wie keine andere. Es ist dies die heilige christliche Kirche, die Gemeinde der Heiligen. Wer immer an Jesum Christum als einigen Heiland glaubt, ist ein Glied dieser Gemeinschaft. Diese ist über die ganze Welt zerstreut. Sie ist unsichtbar. Aber diese Gemeinschaft gibt sich zu erkennen. Christen an einem Orte tun sich zu Gemeinden zusammen. Und mehrere Gemeinden bilden größere Kirchenkörper. Da die Glieder der Kirche einen Leib bilden, so liegt es in der Natur der Sache, daß die Christen sich umeinander bekümmern, in Gemeinschaft miteinander treten und füreinander sorgen. Als die Apostel hörten, daß Samaria das Wort Gottes angenommen hatte, schickten sie alsbald eine Deputation dorthin und richteten die Glaubensgemeinschaft auf. Und als in Antiochien eine christliche Gemeinde gegründet war, wurde sie von Propheten aus Jerusalem besucht, Apost. 11, 27. Ferner lernen wir aus den Briefen der Apostel, daß zwischen den Gemeinden in Asien und Griechenland ein reger Verkehr bestand ohne eine eigentliche Synodalorganisation.

Auch wir erkennen außerhalb unserer Synode alle rechtgläubigen Gemeinden und Kirchenkörper als Glaubensgenossen an und interessieren

uns für sie, so für die Freikirchen in Europa und Australien. Als wir hörten, daß Pastor Bäuerle auf der Insel Äsel um seines Glaubens willen aus der Landeskirche ausgetreten war, fühlten wir uns sofort mit ihm verbunden und gedungen, ihm in seiner Not beizuspringen.

Um nun dieser Verbundenheit Ausdruck zu geben und die Gemeinschaft recht pflegen zu können, ist unsere Synode gegründet worden. Alle, die zu unserer Synode gehören, erkennen sich gegenseitig als Glaubensbrüder an und haben sich zusammengetan, um sich gegenseitig zu erbauen, im Glauben zu stärken und allerlei christliche Werke zu verrichten. Unsere Synode ist konstituiert aus Gemeinden; doch sind alle unsere Pastoren und Lehrer stehende, beratende Glieder und so aufs innigste mit der Synode verbunden.

1. Die Synode muß unsern Pastoren lieb und wert sein; ihr Wohlergehen muß ihnen beständig am Herzen liegen; sie müssen sie nicht als einen Fremdkörper behandeln, sondern als einen Körper, an dem der Pastor ein Glied ist. Wie nun die einzelnen Glieder für den Körper sorgen, so sollen unsere Pastoren für unsere Synode sorgen, ihre Schwächen und Gebrechen tragen und zu heilen suchen, für ihr Wohlergehen beten und sich mit ihren Kämpfen und Nöten identifizieren. Wenn der Pastor so beständig das Wohl der Synode im Auge hat, dann wird er auch für seine Person durch seine Zugehörigkeit zur Synode reichlich gesegnet werden, wie ein Glied am Körper beständig vom Körper Nutzen hat.

2. Um nun ein recht bewußtes und tätiges Glied der Synode zu sein, ist es nötig, daß der Pastor die Synode genau kennt.

a. Zunächst muß er bekannt sein mit der Organisation der Synode. Diese ist ersichtlich aus der Konstitution der Synode. Diese wurde bei der Gründung der Synode angenommen und ist bis auf den heutigen Tag dieselbe geblieben. Es kommt darin klar zum Ausdruck, daß die Synode ihren Gliedern gegenüber keine gesetzgebende Gewalt hat, sondern ein beratender Körper ist. In § 7 heißt es: „Die Synode ist ihren Mitgliedern gegenüber keine Kirchenobrigkeit mit gesetzgebender, zwingender Gewalt und in betreff der Selbstregierung der einzelnen Gemeinden nur ein beratender Körper. Es hat daher kein Beschluß der Synode, wenn derselbe den einzelnen Gemeinden etwas auferlegt, was nicht dem Worte Gottes gemäß oder ihnen für ihre Verhältnisse ungeeignet erscheint, bindende Kraft.“ Diese Erklärung war auf das ausdrückliche Verlangen der St. Louiser Gemeinde abgegeben, die sich wegen der Erfahrung, die sie mit Stephan gemacht hatte, gegen jegliche hierarchische Tendenzen schützen wollte. Unsere Synode schlug durch diese Erklärung neue Bahnen ein. In all den damaligen lutherischen Synoden war hierarchische Praxis. Die Synode oder das Ministerium herrschte über die Gemeinden. Unsere Synodalverfassung erkennt das allgemeine Priestertum aller Christen an sowie die Hoheit und Souveränität einer christlichen Gemeinde.

b. Ferner muß ein Pastor, um ein tätiges Glied der Synode zu sein, ihre Geschichte kennen. Wie nur der ein rechter Patriot sein kann, der die Geschichte seines Landes kennt, so wird auch nur der ein gutes Synodalglied sein, der die Geschichte der Synode kennt. Zunächst die Gründung, die augenscheinlich unter Gottes Leitung und Führung stand. Dann die Lehrkämpfe. Der erste große Lehrkampf wurde über Kirche und Amt geführt. Der Kampf zog die ganze lutherische Kirche hüben und drüben in Mitleidenschaft. Es handelte sich um die Fragen, was die Kirche sei, welche Rechte sie habe und wie das Pfarramt entstehe. Unsere Synode ging siegreich aus dem Kampfe hervor. Ein gesundes Gemeindegewesen erwuchs an vielen Orten. — Einen andern Kampf hatte die Synode zu bestehen mit Schwärmern und Sekten, zumal mit den Abrechtsbrüdern, die in die lutherischen Kolonien eindrangten und Verwirrung anrichteten. Der „Lutheraner“, Traktate und unsere Reiseprediger führten diesen Kampf so erfolgreich, daß der Einfluß dieser Schwärmer unter den Eingewanderten immer geringer wurde. — In den sogenannten lutherischen Synoden unsers Landes sah es traurig aus. Da war wenig Erkenntnis der reinen Lehre, keine gesunde Praxis, sondern unionistisches Wesen herrschte. Unsere Väter griffen diese Mißstände an. Es kam zu Sichtungen. Im Jahre 1872 wurde die Synodalkonferenz gegründet, in der sich auf Grund des lutherischen Bekenntnisses unsere Synode, die Synoden von Wisconsin, Ohio, Minnesota, Illinois sowie die Norwegische Synode zusammenschlossen. In der Generalsynode kam es zur Scheidung und zur Gründung des Council. Der damalige Einfluß unserer Synode auf andere lutherische Synoden war zumal durch Walthers Wirken kein geringer. — Dann brach um das Jahr 1879 der Gnadenwahllehrstreit aus, der die lutherische Kirche unsers Landes bis ins Mark erschütterte und in dem vieler Herzen Gedanken offenbar wurden. Unsere Väter standen fest, wohl wissend, daß es sich in diesem Streite handle um das Zentrum der christlichen Lehre, die Gnade Gottes in Christo Jesu. — Auch gegen das Logenwesen hat die Synode seit ihrem Bestehen Stellung genommen und keine Kompromisse gemacht, sondern ihre Opposition immer bestimmter zum Ausdruck gebracht. — Ein Pastor muß diese Kämpfe seiner Synode studieren und sich dann auf dem laufenden halten durch fleißiges Lesen der Publikationen der Synode, zumal des *CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY*.

c. Auch muß der Pastor bekannt sein mit dem Erziehungswesen unserer Synode, wissen, warum wir von jeher so großes Gewicht gelegt haben auf die Gemeindeschule und wie sich unsere Lehranstalten unter Gottes Segen aus kleinen Anfängen zu großen Pflanzstätten der Kirche entwickelt haben. Er muß ferner bekannt sein mit der Missionsgeschichte unserer Synode im Inland und Ausland, um daraus zu lernen, wie Mission zu treiben ist.

d. Will ein Pastor der Synode zum Segen sein, dann muß er sich stets gegenwärtig halten, welches der Zweck der Synodalverbindung ist.

und an seinem Teile mithelfen, daß dieser Zweck erreicht wird. Über den Zweck der Synode spricht sich unsere Konstitution in § 3 aus. Hier ist ein großartiges und herrliches Programm dargeboten, nachdem unsere Synode gearbeitet und viel Segen gestiftet hat. Es ist kurz folgendes: Zunächst will die Synode in ihrer Mitte sorgen für Einheit in der Lehre und deswegen Front machen gegen alles sektiererische Wesen. Das ist, was Gott zunächst von der Kirche erwartet: Festhalten an der Lehre. Dagegen muß alles andere zurücktreten. Dann kommt vereinte Ausbreitung des Reiches Gottes, Heranbildung von Dienern der Kirche, Herausgabe und Verbreitung der Bibel und christlicher Literatur, Anstrebung gleichförmiger Praxis und gleichförmiger Zeremonien. Dann setzt die Synode auf ihr Programm die Förderung der christlichen Gemeindefchule und einen christlichen Konfirmandenunterricht. Außerdem führt die Synode ein Aufsichtsamt über die Gemeinden, Prediger und Lehrer und sieht darauf, daß Gemeinden, Prediger und Lehrer in ihren Rechten geschützt werden. Dies geschieht unter anderem durch Visitationen und Untersuchungen seitens der Synodalbeamten. Welch herrliches Programm und welch ein Segen, wenn ein Pastor sich daran fleißig beteiligt!

3. Es ist die Pflicht unserer Pastoren, dafür zu sorgen, daß ihre Gemeinden recht synodalbewußt werden. Manche Gemeinde hat eine Abneigung gegen Anschluß an die Synode. Sie meint, sie verliere dadurch ihre Selbständigkeit oder auch ihr Kirchengeneigntum. Solche Bedenken muß ihr der Pastor nehmen. Es ist nicht ratsam, daß man bei einer neugegründeten Gemeinde den Anschluß hinauschiebt. Junge Gemeinden sind leicht zu bewegen, sich der Synode anzuschließen, während es oft Not macht bei alten Gemeinden. Da können einige Glieder es verhindern. Man erzielt den Anschluß, wenn man den Gemeinden die Arbeit und den Zweck der Synode zeigt und sie daran erinnert, daß das alles Werke sind, an denen ein Christ sich beteiligen und seine Freude haben sollte.

Im allgemeinen darf man wohl sagen, daß unsere Glieder Synodalbewußtsein haben, daß sie ihre Synode lieben und sich gern an ihren Werken beteiligen. Das Niveau hängt vornehmlich vom Pastor ab. Redet er fleißig von den Werken der Synode in der Predigt, in der Gemeindeversammlung und vor den Vereinen, weist er hin auf unsere Lehranstalten und Missionen, sorgt er dafür, daß „Lutheraner“ und *Witness* gelesen werden, so wird die Frucht nicht ausbleiben. Ein Pastor muß sich hüten, daß er nicht gegen die Synode und ihre Werke erkaltet, weil ihm etwa dies oder jenes nicht gefällt oder etwa sein Ehrgefühl irgendwie verletzt ist. Er steht dann in Gefahr, durch Kritik und Aburteilen seine Glieder zu entfremden. Es kann nicht genug betont werden, welch wichtiger Faktor der Pastor für unsere Synode ist. Verhält er sich gegen ein Unternehmen der Synode ablehnend oder auch nur passiv, so nützen alle Artikel in unsern Blättern, alle Literatur und Briefe der Präsidcs

sehr wenig, während, wenn der Pastor begeistert ist, seine Gemeinde in der Regel auch begeistert wird.

4. Um auf ein anderes Kapitel zu kommen. Der Pastor als Synodalglied muß auch im rechten Verhältnis zu seinen Amtsbrüdern stehen. Luther sagt: Ich weiß von keinem größeren *donum*, das wir haben, denn *concordiam docentium*. Wie durch Uneinigkeit unter den Pastoren Synoden zerrissen worden sind, so hilft gerade Einigkeit unter den Pastoren, das Band der Synode zu halten. Pastoren sollten daher fleißig Konferenzen und Synoden besuchen, amtsbrüderlichen Verkehr pflegen, Fehler und Gebrechen tragen und sich gegenseitig zurecht helfen mit sanftmütigem Geist. Zur Ehre Gottes darf gesagt werden, daß bis auf den heutigen Tag das Verhältnis unserer Pastoren zueinander ein feines ist und daß unter den Pastoren der Missouriynode ein gewisser Korpsgeist besteht.

5. Endlich ist noch zu erwähnen, daß der Pastor als Synodalglied im rechten Verhältnis zu den Synodalbeamten stehen muß, vornehmlich zu seinem Distriktspräses und Visitator und dann zu den verschiedenen Behörden und Kommissionen. Alle diese Beamten haben keine gesetzgebende Gewalt, aber wir haben sie erwählt, um uns und unsern Gemeinden zu dienen, sie zu beraten und ihnen zu helfen. Ein Pastor sollte daher sich davor hüten, über seine Beamten lieblos zu urteilen, oder sie in seinem Herzen zu verachten, sondern sich ihres Rats fleißig bedienen, wenn er Schwierigkeiten in seiner Gemeinde hat, wenn er persönlichen Rat bedarf, zumal in Berufssachen. Die Präsidcs und auch die Visitatoren werden in der Regel mit großer Vorsicht gewählt, sind Männer voll Weisheit und Erfahrung und sollten daher eine Art väterlicher Stellung den Pastoren gegenüber einnehmen.

Schluß. Wolle der Herr helfen, daß alle unsere Pastoren treu zu unserer Synode stehen! Dann kann der Segen nicht ausbleiben.

J. Pfotenhauer

The False Arguments for the Modern Theory of Open Questions

A translation of Dr. C. F. W. Walther's article entitled
 "Die falschen Stuetzen der modernen Theorie von den offenen Fragen,"
Lehre und Wehre, XIV (1868)

In the foreword of the present volume of this journal we stated in which sense one may without hesitation speak of open questions. At the same time we declared that we reject the modern theory of open questions. It appears necessary, however, that we point out how untenable the arguments are which are advanced in support and justification of this theory. Those that are radical

say: "The Bible is no law codex. To deduce a teaching which must be believed from every incidental utterance of it is a mechanical use of the Bible. What is important is to penetrate into its spirit, to lay hold of its system; everything else is merely framework, unessential, unimportant." It is not necessary to refute this argumentation. It is that of the rationalist. Whoever really accepts the Holy Scriptures as God's Book and Word, that is, whoever is a Christian, will not speak thus. For the Christian the Bible is indeed "a law codex," but not only that. The Son of God Himself declared: "The Scripture cannot be broken," John 10:35. How much more should a Christian consider every word in the Scriptures as binding for himself! For him Holy Scripture is indeed "the Law of the Lord." Whoever thinks that he can find one error in Holy Scripture does not believe in Holy Scripture but in himself; for even if he accepted everything else as true, he would believe it not because Scripture says so but because it agrees with his reason or with his sentiments. Luther writes: "Dear friend, God's Word is God's Word. No one dare tinker with it. Whoever blasphemously gives the lie to God in one word and says that such blaspheming and criticizing is a little matter blasphemes God in His totality and considers *all* blaspheming of God a light matter. God is One who cannot be divided and here be praised and there be reprehended, here be honored and there despised. . . . Consider this: The circumcision of Abraham is an old, dead matter and no longer either necessary or profitable. Yet if I say that God at the time did not command it, my avowal of belief in the Gospel would not help me. That is what St. James means when he says (chap. 2:10), 'For whosoever shall keep the whole Law and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all.'" (Walch, XX, 965.)

Others appeal to the fact that in this life there can be no absolute unity but merely a fundamental one. They refer to the apostle's statement that in the Church many using the right Foundation build on it wood, hay, and stubble by teaching erroneous human ideas, which indeed do not stand the testing fire, but which do not rob one of eternal salvation because they do not overthrow the one true Foundation, 1 Cor. 3:10-15. (Cp. article "On the Church" in the Apology of the Augsburg Confession.) For this reason, so they assert, the old orthodox dogmatists taught with respect to doctrines that are non-fundamental one may without jeopardy to one's salvation argue for or against their acceptance. — We reply as follows: This justification of open questions rests on a gross misunderstanding and confusion. In considering the question, What belongs to the fundamental articles which a man must know or which one may not deny? the point

at issue is not what a Christian may accept or reject in matters of faith, but rather how much of divine truth is required in order that a person may arrive at, and be preserved in, saving faith and how much of saving truth a person may be ignorant of or deny and oppose without making the existence and continuance of true, justifying, and saving faith in his heart an impossibility.

We admit that a discussion of this matter is of great importance. In the first place, since the great majority of church-bodies are polluted with many errors, it is important to know in which of them, in spite of the existence of fundamental errors, one may still find true believers and hence members of the true invisible Church. Furthermore, even in orthodox churches in which the Word of God is taught in its purity and the Sacraments are administered according to the Lord's institution, there are many that are weak in Christian understanding and still entertain erroneous views. Therefore it is highly important to know whether such members may nevertheless be regarded as possessing true faith and, in spite of their weakness in spiritual understanding, be saved or whether all such weak Christians must be classed with the lost and condemned. Now, let it be observed that Paul in 1 Cor. 3 by no means wishes to say that a Christian merely has to accept the articles that are fundamental, that everything else belongs to the category of open questions where there is liberty and that nobody should look upon a person askance or censure him when in dealing with matters of this category he either accepts or rejects what the Scriptures clearly teach. On the contrary, St. Paul and all other writers of Holy Scripture testify that a little leaven of false teaching leavens the whole lump, that no man has the liberty to add or subtract anything with respect to the Word of God, and that God looks upon him only as His child who trembleth at His Word, Is. 66:2. It is very evident, too, that our old dogmaticians, in pointing out that in respect to non-fundamental articles there may be a difference of opinion, do not wish to say that among the teachings clearly revealed in God's Word there are open questions concerning which a person may *under all circumstances* take any view at all. This is evident from the fact that among these articles they, for instance, place the following: the everlasting rejection of a number of angels, the immortality of man before the Fall, the irremissibility of the sin against the Holy Ghost, the burial of Christ, the proceeding of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son, the creation of the world in six days, the visibility or invisibility of the Church and its marks. Will anybody, be his acquaintance with our fathers ever so slight, hold that they meant to say the Church might tolerate the teaching that the devil will ultimately be saved,

that man originally was subject to death, that Christ was not buried, that the sin against the Holy Ghost can be forgiven, that the Holy Spirit does not proceed from the Son, that the world was created in six millennia, etc? Everybody must say that the old dogmaticians looked upon these points as belonging to the non-fundamental articles merely because ignorance as to Scripture-teaching on these matters and the resulting errors do not preclude the possibility of the existence of true, justifying faith.

For this reason Quenstedt also, having, like Hunnius, mentioned among other things the first three points enumerated above, adds: "If these matters are unknown and denied, such a course does not *by itself* inflict injury, since no cause of faith or any fundamental dogma is made invalid through such denial." (*Theol. did.-pol.* I, 352.) By introducing the restriction *by itself*, Quenstedt himself indicates that, if a Christian should come to know or be shown that those non-fundamental articles are clear Scripture-teaching and if he should nevertheless deny or oppose them, such a course would indeed bring him injury, since thereby he would overthrow not indeed the real and dogmatic [the doctrines of the Holy Trinity and of justification by grace through faith] but the organic foundation, Holy Scripture, and thus lose in his heart the essential foundation, Christ. For this reason Aegidius Hunnius confronted the Jesuits Gretser and Tanner at the colloquium of Regensburg in 1601 with the following: "The story of the incest of Judah and Thamar need not become known to all Christians; for there are innumerable believers who are not acquainted with this story; hence this account is not an article of faith, although those people that hear it read from the Bible or read it themselves must believe it as a matter of faith (*licet de fide*) and an account of the Holy Spirit Himself. . . . Indeed, he is a heretic who denies an article of faith; however, not only he but that person also who denies a historical narrative of the Holy Spirit. . . . There are minor errors which are contrary to articles that are less important, which errors the apostle compares to stubble that is burned in the fire of tribulation, in such a way, however, that the erring person himself is saved, since he clings to the foundation of salvation, the Rock, Christ. His work, of course, though built on the right foundation, suffers injury. It is something different if somebody should say contemptuously: 'For me the foundation of salvation is sufficient, and I am satisfied if I fully accept this article,' and if such a person should refuse to receive fuller instruction in the remaining doctrines. It is true that such a person would err with regard to minor articles; however, his error would not be insignificant but be connected with

contempt of the divine Word." (*Colloq. Ratisbonae*, hab. Lauingae, p. 351 sqq.)

Buddeus also, after dwelling on the articles without which the generation and preservation of true, justifying faith in the heart, and hence salvation, is not possible, finally adds: "It will be observed that we do not speak of that which must be believed because it has been revealed by God but of that which a person must believe in order to be saved; for in Holy Scripture many things are contained which we must in true faith accept since they have been revealed to us by God" (even if they do not belong to the articles of faith), "which, however, are not necessarily required for obtaining salvation. Besides, many things are required and therefore necessary if a person is to be a member of a particular Church, and still more, if one is to be a pastor in that Church, even though such matters are not at once required for salvation; and hence we do not speak of them here." (*Institut. th. dogm.* Lips., 1724, p. 41.) Here Buddeus expressly declares that in the doctrine concerning articles of faith the question is not considered what a person who has Holy Scripture and knows it and has been shown what its teachings are must on account of its authority believe. When the question is asked, Which doctrines contained in the Scriptures must be accepted? then it no longer is proper to distinguish between the various doctrines [as to their importance], a distinction which is justified when articles of faith are dwelt on. If a man has become convinced that a certain matter is taught in the Holy Scriptures, then his attempt to destroy or remove the smallest letter, even a tittle, of such teaching excludes [him] from the kingdom of heaven, while otherwise a person may entertain even a serious error which involves acceptance of a heresy without losing faith, grace, and salvation.

Nikolaus Hunnius, as is known, was the first one of our theologians who treated the doctrine concerning fundamental articles in a comprehensive and systematic manner. He did this in a writing entitled *Diaskepsis Theologica de Fundamentalibus Dissensu Doctrinae Evangelicae-Lutheranae et Calvinianae seu Reformatae*. Wittebergae, 1626. He strictly adheres to the position that the "dogmatic foundation is that part of divine doctrine which alone, when it is preached to a person, generates in him justifying and saving faith and without the teaching of which saving faith cannot be begotten" (par. 95), and he removes all those Biblical doctrines from the fundamental articles which are not inseparably connected with the creation of true faith. Hence he writes: "Whatever dogma is not necessary is not a part of the foundation of faith. No dogma is a necessary one if faith can exist without it or has ever existed without it. Such a dogma therefore is not

a part of the foundation of faith. A person may be ignorant of Christ's birth in Bethlehem, of His teaching in the Temple when He was twelve years old, and of many other historical matters; he may be ignorant of the fact that the evangelists and apostles wrote and of what they wrote; he may deny that the prophesied Antichrist has appeared or that the world in its substance will be destroyed. All this does not jeopardize eternal life, and if one is ignorant of these doctrines or denies them, saving faith can nevertheless continue. However, what belongs to the foundation not only cannot be denied, but must not be unknown, that is, faith must not be ignorant of it (*a fide abesse*)." (Par. 237.)

In a later paragraph Hunnius writes: "Whatever dogma may be unknown to a person without injury to his faith is not fundamental either in the sense of constituting the foundation or of being an essential part of it. The doctrine of the Sacraments is such a dogma. Hence the doctrine of the Sacraments is not fundamental." (Par. 311.) We adduce these statements of our Hunnius not to prove that he denies that the doctrine of the Sacraments belongs to the fundamental articles in the sense in which the later theologians regard it as such; we rather wish to prove that it is a gross misunderstanding to assume that our old theologians, in distinguishing between fundamental and non-fundamental articles, intended to say that all non-fundamental doctrines are open questions in the modern sense of the term. Hunnius himself feared that careless readers might thus misunderstand him and in advance guarded against such an interpretation of his words. Among other things he writes: "Salutary doctrine is of two kinds. The one is that which is the direct cause of faith or brings about that a man believes in God and Christ; on this doctrine is based his firm confidence of receiving forgiveness of sins and eternal salvation. The other is that which indeed does not engender this confidence but nevertheless is placed by God before men either to explain faith or to teach other matters necessary for being a Christian. Whoever errs in the first kind of doctrine errs not only perilously but with respect to faith itself (*circa fidem*); he that errs in the second kind of doctrine errs perilously but not with respect to the doctrine of faith, but from the moral point of view. In the latter case the confidence which constitutes faith is not directly destroyed, that is, there is no direct rejection of the teaching through which confidence is begotten, but the wrath of God is provoked by an error in this sphere. He who denies the stories of Samson, of David, etc., or who denies that circumcision was a divine institution, etc., thereby does not detract anything from the foundation of faith or fundamental doctrine, but he nevertheless errs with peril to his salvation, because by attacking the majestic truth-

fulness of God, he offends Him through a mortal sin and thereby provokes His wrath, a course which means loss of faith and of salvation unless repentance follows. To this category belong the virgin birth of Christ and many other dogmas, whose denial does not overthrow or adulterate (*depravat*) the fundamental articles of faith but arouses the divine wrath, so that faith ceases because the Originator of faith [God] has withdrawn, although the foundation of it still stands. . . . If in the following the expression occurs: 'This or that dogma may without injury to the foundation of faith remain unknown or be denied,' the sense of the expression is by no means that such denial or ignorance may occur without injury to faith itself, since such a denial may destroy faith even though it does not subvert its [doctrinal] foundation." (§§ 351, 353.) To declare everything that is non-fundamental an open question even if it is clearly revealed in the Word of God is nothing less than saying that the commission of mortal sins is a matter of indifference.

But the question will be asked, Does it not happen frequently, yes, is it not the universal lot of men, that they err in *weakness*, and are we not to receive those that are weak in the faith, and must therefore not their error, caused by weakness, especially if it does not subvert the foundation, be excluded from the category of divisive errors and hence in reality be enumerated among open questions? We reply: An error due to lack of understanding or overhasty decision, hence to weakness, must indeed never be treated as a heresy and may never be looked upon as divisive of church-fellowship, be it ever so gross. Accordingly we see that in the apostolic times even those people were not excluded from the Church who owing to weakness in their understanding of divine truth even taught the fundamental error mentioned Acts 15:1: "Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved." But although in the case of an error caused by weakness the erring brother must be tolerated, we have to say, in the first place, that the error itself must never be tolerated by the Church even if it appears insignificant and not dangerous, provided it opposes a clear word of God. Such an error hence may never be treated as an open question. Neither the Church nor its servants are masters of the Word. On the contrary, to the Church are committed for faithful administration the oracles of God, Rom. 3:2; and its ministers are at the same time ministers of the Word, Luke 1:2, who have been given the command, "Continue thou in the things which thou hast learned and hast been assured of," 2 Tim. 3:14; "That good thing which was committed unto thee keep by the Holy Ghost," 2 Tim. 1:14. Hence Musaeus writes: "God has committed to His Church, as to the spiritual

mother of all believing children of God, not only the chief articles of Christian truth which every simple Christian must believe and without the knowledge and acceptance of which true faith cannot be engendered or preserved, but the whole Christian doctrine pertaining to faith and life, likewise the holy Sacraments, and He expects the Church to keep these treasures pure and unadulterated, to preserve them, defend them against all seducing spirits, to use them, thereby to beget spiritual children for God and bring them up that they may grow in saving knowledge from day to day. It is thereby to strengthen the weak, to cheer those that are troubled, to comfort the timid, to arouse the wicked and the secure sinners, to bring back those that are erring, to seek the lost, and thus to perform most carefully everything that pertains to the duties of a spiritual mother toward God's true children here upon earth, and it has no authority to eliminate any part of Christian doctrine which for this purpose has been committed to it and without whose use it cannot fully perform its function for the edification of its members and the true children of God. What Paul says to Timothy (1 Tim. 4:15; 6:3 ff.; 2 Tim. 3:14; 1:13,14) he says to the whole Christian Church, and what he demands of *bishops* in general, namely, to hold fast the faithful Word as they have been taught, that they may be able by sound doctrine both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers (Titus 1:9), that he demands from all godly, faithful teachers. This is the public function of the Church and of its faithful teachers, that they immovably, rigidly, and firmly adhere not only to the articles and sections of Christian doctrine which every simple Christian must know but to those also which faithful teachers and pastors need to make others wise unto salvation and which are profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, as Paul says 2 Tim. 3:15 f. Of these matters it must not permit any part to be adulterated or removed." (*Bedenken vom Consensu Repetito*; cf. *Hist. Syncret.*, p. 1073.) Hence it is certain that, since all Scripture is given by inspiration of God and is profitable, the Church may not adulterate or eliminate anything contained in Holy Scripture but must earnestly hold every Biblical truth, even if it should appear insignificant, oppose every unscriptural error, should it seem ever so unimportant.

How is that? we are asked. Do you really wish to excommunicate everybody at once as a heretic who errs in nothing but a non-fundamental article, and do you intend at once to sever fellowship with an organization which is guilty of such a non-fundamental error? That we are far removed from entertaining such a thought we have stated above. What we maintain is this: On the one hand, a non-fundamental error, even if it is contrary

to the clear Word of God, must not be treated as a heresy, but in patient instruction it must be shown to be untenable, be refuted, opposed, and criticized. On the other hand, however, if a church has exhausted all means of bringing such an erring brother to the acknowledgment of the truth and his adherence to the respective error evidently is not due to insufficient intellectual understanding of Scripture-teaching, and hence through this non-fundamental error it becomes manifest that he consciously, stubbornly, and obstinately contradicts the divine Word and that accordingly through his error he subverts the organic foundation of faith [the Scriptures], then such an erring person, like all others that persevere in mortal sins, must no longer be borne with, but fraternal relations with him must be terminated. The same thing applies to a whole church-body which errs in a non-fundamental doctrine. It is very true that in this life absolute unity in faith and doctrine is not possible, and no higher unity than a fundamental one can be attained. This, however, by no means implies that in a church-body errors of a non-fundamental nature which become manifest and which contradict the clear Word of God must not be attacked and that a Church can be regarded as a true church and be treated as such if it either makes such non-fundamental errors a part of its confession and, with injury to the organic foundation, in spite of all admonition, stubbornly clings to these errors or in a unionistic fashion and in a spirit of indifference insists that a deviation from God's clear Word in such points need be of no concern to us.

(To be continued)

A.

Sermon Study on 1 Cor. 10:16, 17

Eisenach Epistle for Maundy Thursday

In v. 14 of 1 Cor. 10 Paul had warned against idolatry, particularly against that form of idolatry which seems to have been quite the vogue with some of the Corinthian Christians, participation in idol feasts. Already in chap. 8:8-13 he had called their attention to the offense given by this custom. While the eating of any meat at home was permitted, even if that meat came from animals offered to the idols, 8:1-7; cp. 10:25-30, it was quite a different matter to sit in the temple of the idol and take part in the sacrificial meal served there. That was actually participating in the idol feast, therefore participating in idolatry. In order to warn his readers against this sin, he points out the incompatibility of partaking of the Lord's Table and that of the devil. Participation in the worship is fellowshiping with the deity worshiped at that ser-

vice or festival. This is true of Israel, v. 18; this applies also to the idolaters, vv. 19, 20. That holds good also of Christians attending the Lord's Table. There they are actually partaking of, entering into close communion with, the body and blood of their Lord and with all their fellow-communicants, and therefore "you cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of the devils," v. 21. Hence flee idolatry. Do not attend the idol feasts.

We must not overlook the manner in which the apostle introduces his line of argumentation in v. 15: "I speak as to wise men; judge ye what I say." He calls them "wise men." In 1 Cor. 4:10 (where this word is used in opposition to *μωροί*) and in 2 Cor. 11:19 (opposed to *ἄφρονες*) Paul had used this term ironically. In our passage he evidently employs the term as a permissible *captatio benevolentiae* in order to make his readers the more willing to accept his admonition and flee every form of idolatry. The wise man, *φρόνιμος*, a term used in the LXX in translation of *חָכָם*, designates a man who is able to distinguish between matters, to discern, to perceive clearly, and on the basis of this ability can sift the arguments advanced thoroughly and arrive at correct conclusions and judgments. Since the Corinthians were enriched by the grace of God through the Gospel, cp. 1 Cor. 1:4-7; since the Lord Himself had made them wise in these matters, they would be able to follow his line of argumentation, to grasp the underlying principles, to arrive at the conclusion that the course of action demanded by him was the only correct and proper one, the only one in keeping with the Word and the will of God.

We need the wisdom from above whenever we read or study the Word of God. We need that wisdom particularly in studying that doctrine to which the apostle calls the attention of his readers in the passage before us, the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. May He enable us to judge properly, to understand correctly, and to accept as heavenly wisdom what the apostle says in these words!

The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? V. 16. The apostle does not follow the order of institution, nor does he mention all the details of the institution or all the blessed fruits of the Sacrament. He singles out only such facts as are relevant to the point under discussion, since he knows that his readers are well acquainted with the doctrine and the history of the institution of the Holy Supper. It was not his purpose to show just at which point the communion of the bread and body, the wine and the blood, takes place. His only object was to stress the fact of such a communion in the Sacrament. Note that the apostle makes mention of all the sacramental elements and of the three sacramental acts: the blessing, or consecrat-

ing, v. 16 a; the breaking, or distribution, v. 16 b; the partaking of the elements, eating bread and drinking wine, v. 17. He is, however, here not speaking of the effects of each individual act but of the administration of the Sacrament in its entirety, as originally instituted by Christ. He does not mean to teach that the cup becomes the communion of the blood at the moment of the blessing or consecration and that the bread becomes the communion of the body of Christ at the moment of its being broken. While speaking only of the blessing of the cup and only of the breaking and partaking of the bread, it is evident that the cup must not only be blessed but also distributed and drunk and the bread not only broken and eaten but blessed as well prior to such distribution. Omitting the distribution and drinking of the blessed cup and the blessing of the bread, we would not be celebrating the Lord's Supper; for we would not be doing what the Lord did when He instituted the Sacrament and what He told us to do, "This do!" Only when we do what the Lord told us to do, only when we eat the bread that was blessed and drink the cup that was blessed, only then can we be sure that this bread is indeed the communion of the body, this wine the communion of the blood, of Christ.

The apostle begins his line of argument with a reference to the communion existing between the cup and the blood of Christ, "because he intends to elaborate the statement regarding the sacramental bread" (Lenski). "The cup," of course, stands metaphorically for the contents of the cup, fruit of the vine, wine, Matt. 26:29; for Christ did not ask His disciples to partake of the cup, the metal container, but of its contents—"Drink ye all of it."

This cup is called "the cup of blessing." This expression occurs only here in the New Testament. Various translations have been proposed by commentators. It may mean the cup which is being blessed by the congregation. We do not see the need of the repetition "which we bless" in this case. It is better to refer the blessing to the first blessing pronounced over the cup by Christ Himself. Many commentators hold that Paul had adopted this expression from the ritual of the Passover. *Expositor's Greek Testament* offers the following comment: "The prevalent interpretation of τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας makes the phrase a rendering of *Kos Habb'rakah*, the third cup of the Passover meal, over which a special blessing was pronounced (often identified with that of the Eucharist), or, as Edward thinks (referring to Luke 22:20), the fourth, which closed the meal and was attended with the singing of the Hallel. Such a technical Hebraism would scarcely be obvious to the Corinthians, and the genitive so construed is artificial in point of Greek idiom." Yet this term was well known to Paul, and he may well have used it since it so aptly described the cup of the Eucharist,

over which Christ Himself had pronounced the blessing. Of course, the blessing spoken over the Passover cup could not have constituted that cup a communion of the blood of Christ. That required a special blessing, essentially different from that spoken over the third Passover cup.

While Paul mentions the blessing only when speaking of the cup, Matthew and Mark use the term blessing only in connection with the bread, Matt. 26:26; Mark 14:22. According to them a *thanksgiving* was pronounced over the cup, while Luke merely mentions a thanksgiving in reference to the bread. There can be no doubt that Christ spoke words of thanksgiving and words of blessing at the first institution.

The words thanksgiving and blessing are not synonymous terms. *Εὐχαριστέω* and its noun and adjective in the New Testament invariably refer to the giving of thanks, and according to Bauer, *Woerterbuch zum N. T.*, the object, expressed or implied, with the one exception of Rom. 16:4, is always God. *Εὐλογέω* and its noun and adjective denote a speaking well, speaking good things. Used with God as its object, it signifies praise; and therefore it very closely approaches the meaning of thanksgiving, as in 1 Cor. 14:16,17, where the prayer is one of grateful praise, or praising gratitude, combining both praise and thanksgiving. With other objects it usually denotes a blessing, a benediction, wishing well, or speaking good things concerning a person or thing. Christ indeed spoke good things concerning the cup of the Eucharist. By virtue of the words spoken by Christ on that occasion this cup became indeed a cup of blessing, a blessed cup, a cup honored in a manner in which no other cup had been honored before; it was separated from all other cups and placed into a class by itself. It was made a cup which was to convey to the disciples assembled there the blood of their Savior, with which blood the cup, while being given to the Twelve, was by the word of Christ Himself placed into intimate communion and fellowship, so that they drank not the wine alone, but with it they drank the very blood of the Son of God to be shed for them for the remission of their sin. Thereby this cup, blessed and honored in itself, became the source of blessing to the disciples. When God blessed Abraham, He told him, "I will bless thee and make thy name great, and thou shalt be a blessing," Gen. 12:2. Jesus assures His believers that the waters of life which He gives in the word of the Gospel shall not only in them become a well of water springing up into eternal life, John 4:14, it shall flow out from them in rivers of living water, bringing life and blessing also to others, John 7:38. In like manner the blessing pronounced upon the sacramental cup did not only bless and honor this cup and make its name great, by effecting a communion

of the cup with the blood of Christ, but streams of blessing flowed from this cup into the hearts and lives of the disciples who drank of this cup.

We do not know the exact words which Christ used when He gave thanks to God on that memorable evening. In keeping with the occasion He surely thanked God, His heavenly Father, whose will He had come to fulfil, that now, in accordance with this divine will, His Holy Supper was about to be instituted as an abiding ordinance, as one of the Sacraments of the New Covenant to be established by His blood. Neither are the exact words of His blessing recorded nor the words with which the first Church blessed the elements. Again we need not to be at a loss as to the content of this blessing. Once before Christ had blessed bread, and lo, in a miraculous manner this bread multiplied so as to feed large multitudes, Mark 6:41. The words of blessing must have expressed in some form the intention which Christ had. Now again He blessed bread, and, lo, again miraculous power was given to this bread. Through the omnipotence of Him to whom all power is given, Matt. 28:18; 11:27, it became a means to give to His disciples His own body to eat, or, as Paul expresses it, it became the communion of the body of Christ. Surely, then, the words of blessing pronounced over the bread and the cup brought out in some manner this blessing, the effect of which He announced later, at the distribution, in those majestic words "Take, eat; this is My body, which is given for you." These words were the words of the Son of God and therefore, like all His words, not idle promises, vain wishes, but spirit and life, John 6:63, realities, actualities, Ps. 33:9. And since this Supper was to be celebrated not only once; since Christ Himself charged His Church to do what He had done, in remembrance of Him; since this is to be an abiding ordinance, a Sacrament of the New Covenant, in which the death of the Lord is to be shown forth until He come, this blessing of Him who is in the midst of all who are assembled in His name, is valid and efficacious even unto the end of the world. 1 Chron. 17:27. Cp. Formula of Concord, VII, §§ 75-78; *Trigl.*, p. 999 f.

The apostle adds "which we bless." Is this blessing merely an ancient custom, a liturgical act, an apostolic ordinance, which may be omitted? Nothing could be farther removed from the truth than this. This blessing is one of the essential sacramental acts, comprehended in the command of Jesus "This do." We are to do as He did on that memorable evening. And He took not unblessed bread but bread over which He had pronounced a blessing. Nor are we to take unblessed bread if we would celebrate the Lord's Supper. To omit the blessing would invalidate the Sacrament; we would not be administering the Sacrament Christ

instituted. But how are we to bless the elements? What are the words we must use? We have seen that the words spoken by the Lord during the distribution merely repeated, although perhaps in different phrases, the blessing which He had spoken over the bread and the cup. Now, in the words of the institution as recorded by the evangelists we have also a record of the very words spoken by Christ when He gave to His disciples that bread and wine which He had blessed: "Take, eat; this is My body," etc. Why change these words, which are the *ipsissima verba* of Jesus, which bring out so well the content of the blessing He Himself had pronounced upon the sacramental bread and wine prior to the distribution? Why change them and bring the element of doubt into this Sacrament? And these words of Jesus are placed in their proper setting by repeating the account of the institution of the Supper as recorded by the evangelists and Paul. Hence the Formula of Concord correctly says: "In the administration of the Holy Supper the words of institution are to be publicly spoken or sung before the congregation, distinctly and clearly, and should in no way be omitted," and in proof of this statement refers to Christ's command "This do" and to 1 Cor. 10:16. (Formula of Concord, VII, §§ 79-82; *Trigl.*, p. 1001.)

The apostle says, "We bless." It is not the administrator, the pastor, who does the blessing as his exclusive privilege. No, the administrator is merely the spokesman, the representative, of the congregation, through whom the congregation blesses the elements. Very beautifully Luther writes: "Our pastor steps before the altar, . . . in the hearing of all he very distinctly chants the words of Christ's institution of the Holy Supper, . . . and we, especially those among us who would commune, kneel (during the consecration) alongside of, behind, and around him, . . . all of us real holy priests together with him, sanctified by the blood of Christ, anointed by the Holy Spirit, consecrated in Baptism. . . . We do not let our pastor speak the words of Christ for himself, as though he were speaking them for his own person, but he is our mouthpiece, and we all from our very hearts speak the words with him. . . . If he should make a mistake or become confused or forget whether he have spoken the words, we are there, hear what he says, hold fast to the words, and are sure that they have been spoken; therefore we cannot be deceived." (St. L., XIX, 1279-1281.)

"The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ?" asks the apostle. The answer of course must be, It is. But the question arises, Just what is the meaning of the term communion, *κοινωνία*? The importance of the matter justifies a thorough study.

The word occurs 19 times in the New Testament. It is an

abstract noun derived from the stem κοιν, related to ξύν, with. The adjective κοινός means common, belonging to several, no one having the object for his exclusive use, but sharing its possession with others. The noun κοινωνός designates a partner, an associate, comrade, or a partaker, sharer; cp. 1 Cor. 10:18, 20; Luke 5:10. Κοινωνία denotes fellowship, communion, association, a union of one with another or others. A close study of the 17 passages in which the word occurs besides our text will teach us several facts which have an important bearing on the interpretation of our passage. In the first place, the relation denoted by *koinonia* is never a merely outward relation or connection, as that of an ink-bottle and the writing-desk or of two strangers sitting next to each other. It invariably implies a relation of intimacy, a close connection, an actual fellowship, the partners being bound together by sincere interest in, and activity towards, mutual welfare, the objects united by a close, intimate relation. They are inseparably united for the period of their communion. In the second place, the word denotes a union in which each of the parties retains its individuality. There is no mixing and mingling of one with the other, nor is there a change of one into the other or of the two into something altogether new and essentially different from its constituent parts. Read all the 17 passages, and you will be convinced that both the intimacy of the relation and the retention of individuality on the part of the constituents of the communion are quite evident.

Meyer, in a footnote to 1 Cor. 10:16, insists that κοινωνία in the New Testament never means communication, apportioning, and refers to his notes on Rom. 15:26 in proof of his position. Yet in his notes on our passage he says: "This is aptly explained by Grotius (after Melanchthon and others): '*Κοινωνίαν vocat id, per quod fit ipsa communio.*' (*Koinonian* he calls that whereby the communion itself takes place.) The cup, i. e., its contents as these are presented and partaken of, is the *medium* of this fellowship; it is *realized* in the partaking." He later defines this communion as an inward union of the believer with Christ. Yet by approving of Grotius's explanation of *koinonia*, Meyer practically refutes his claim that the word never means communication. If the cup is the medium of the fellowship, that whereby the communion itself takes place, then the cup must indeed be the communication of Christ, or rather His blood. Kittel's *Theologisches Woerterbuch* registers three usages of the word, having communion, giving communion, communion in an absolute sense. It lists our passage under the first usage. "Brot und Wein sind dem Paulus Traeger der Gegenwart Christi, so wie der juedische Altar die Gegenwart Gottes verbuerget. Das Geniessen von Brot und Wein ist Zusammenschluss (Anteilschaft) mit dem himmlischen Christus." The Vulgate translates "*com-*

municatio sanguinis," "*participatio corporis*," *participatio* having the sense of communication, giving communion. Luther, the Confessions, Chemnitz, and other Lutheran theologians take it in the sense of "giving communion," "communicating." (See Luther, XX: 237, 1082. *Triglotta*, 246, 990, 992, 1000.)

In our opinion the sense of the passage is not in the least altered, and it is therefore of little importance whether the one or the other translation is adopted. In both translations it is evident that two distinct objects are united and distributed. If one prefers the translation "a communion," a fellowship with the blood, then naturally the union between the two is stressed without denying that the cup communicates the blood with which it forms a union. In fact, the latter thought is implied. If one translates, "The cup is the communication of the blood," it is this communication which is stressed, involving, however, as a matter of course, a union, a fellowship, of the cup and the blood; else the cup could not communicate the blood. In the Lord's Supper we receive both wine and blood. Not wine only; but in this Supper the wine is the communion, or the communication, of the blood of Christ. We receive not blood only, as if the wine had ceased to be wine or had been changed into blood; but in union with the blood is the wine, and the blood is communicated to us by means of the wine. In connection herewith the words of the Apology (*Trigl.*, p. 247), quoted approvingly by the Formula of Concord (*Sol. Decl.*, VII, § 7), bear repeating. "Since Paul says: 'The bread which we break is the communion of the body of Christ,' etc., it would follow, if the body of Christ were not, but only the Holy Ghost were, truly present that the bread is not a communion of the body but of the Spirit of Christ." (*Trigl.*, p. 975.)

The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? V. 16 b. What Paul had taught concerning the cup he now repeats with reference to the bread. We note the fact that neither in the first clause of v. 16 nor here the apostle teaches that we receive *Christ*. Not once in the New Testament is this expression used in connection with the elements of the Lord's Supper. Scripture very clearly teaches that we are united with Christ by faith, Rom. 8:9; 13:14; Gal. 2:19, 20; etc., by Baptism, Rom. 6:3-11; Gal. 3:27. But not once are we told that the bread and the cup are a communion, a communication, of Christ. The interpretation of Meyer and of Kittel's *Woerterbuch*, noted above, which is in fact the interpretation of the Calvinistic-Reformed Church, has not the slightest foundation in the text. Quite evidently it is only a weak and unwarranted subterfuge when the author in Kittel's *Woerterbuch* continues: "Sowohl das griechische σῶμα wie das entsprechende aramaeische ܫܡܐ heissen nicht nur Leib, sondern

Person. (Vgl. G. Dalman, *Jesus=Jeschua* (1922), 130 f.) Paulus nennt das Blut neben dem σῶμα wohl deshalb, weil es ihm durch die ueberlieferten Abendmahls Worte dargeboten wurde." The very fact that Paul does mention the blood besides the body, and mentions it first, inverting the traditional words of institution; the very fact that body and blood are differentiated; that it is only bread that is called the communion of the body, while only the cup is called the communion of the blood; that these communions are never interchanged; the fact finally that the New Testament is written in Greek and not in Aramean, that we are bound by the Greek words, not by some supposed Aramean original, that the Corinthians could never have understood the word σῶμα in the sense of person, — all these facts make it imperative to reject this interpretation as incompatible with, and contradictory to, the clear words of the text. In spite of all efforts of unbelief, learned or unlearned, reasonable or unreasonable, to change the meaning of these words, Luther's splendid explanation in his *Small Catechism* is the only interpretation that does justice to the clear words of Paul and the Savior. The Lord's Supper is nothing more nor less than the true body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ under the bread and wine, for us Christians to eat and to drink, instituted by Christ Himself. The mystical union with Christ is one of the effects, one of the fruits of blessings, which the eating and drinking of the body and the blood of Christ grants to all believing communicants, while the body and blood of Christ is given to, and received by, all communicants whether they believe or not. Cp. 1 Cor. 11:27, 29.

The apostle changes his phraseology as compared with 16a. There he had spoken of the blessing of the cup; here he speaks of the breaking of the bread. The blessing of the cup did not symbolize the blessing of the blood, neither does the breaking of the bread symbolize the breaking of the body. The body was not broken, John 19:31-36. In 1 Cor. 11:24 most of the, and the best, manuscripts do not read "broken for you." Sinaiticus, Vaticanus, Alexandrinus, Ephraem Syri, omit it, reading only, "This is My body for you." To break bread means in Biblical language to prepare bread for distribution and eating; cp. Mark 8:19, "I brake the five loaves among," εἰς, unto, "five thousand." The Authorized Version therefore very properly translates the Hebrew word פָּרַס Is. 58:7, not in exact keeping with its etymological meaning, to break, but nevertheless correctly, "to deal thy bread." If the phrase "breaking bread" is used figuratively here, "the analogy is not this, that, as bread may be considered as figuratively killed by breaking it with the hand in small pieces, so was Christ's body literally killed by piercing it with the nails and spear, but is most clearly this, that, as bread, in order to be naturally taken and eaten, must be phys-

ically communicated (to which the natural breaking was necessary), so the body of our Lord Jesus, in order to be sacramentally taken and eaten, must be supernaturally communicated." (Krauth, *Conservative Reformation*, p. 719.) There is, however, not the slightest indication anywhere that these words are to be taken figuratively. They simply state that the Lord took bread and brake it in order to give it to His disciples that they might eat. The form, or shape, of the bread, the manner of distributing it, whether by breaking it or cutting it with a knife or by baking it in a form convenient for distribution, as our wafers, are all matters of indifference as long as in some manner bread is given to the communicants to eat.

For we, being many, are one bread and one body; for we are all partakers of that one bread, v. 17. Unfortunately the translation does not convey the correct sense of the words. Literally translated, the apostle writes: Because one bread, one body the many we are; for we all partake of the one bread, or, the whole number of us are partaking of the one bread. In the first clause "supply ἐστίν, and all is clear," says Lenski (*Corinthians*, p. 418). The οὗ does not prove the preceding statement but gives the reason for what follows. On this position of the οὗ clause see Luke 19:17; John 1:50; 15:19; 20:29. The English translation makes v. 17 prove v. 16, while certainly the fact that we are one body does not prove the bread to be a communion of the body, but is one of the effects of this communion. Moreover, the rendering of the English Bible "confuses two distinct figures." (*Expositor's Greek N.T.*) "To call us Christians 'one bread' introduces a very odd figure, one wholly unnecessary, since we are called 'one body' in the very next statement." (Lenski, l. c., p. 417 f.) "Because there is one bread" refers of course to the bread of which v. 16 had spoken, the bread blessed in consecration, distributed to the communicants, and partaken of by them, v. 17 b. This bread indeed is one. The apostle, of course, has not in mind a physical, material oneness. We have no longer the bread which Christ used, neither did the apostle. In fact, as far as the material, physical, side of the bread is concerned, we do not at all receive one bread, neither quantitatively nor qualitatively. Not quantitatively; for many, many loaves and wafers must be baked in many, many ovens in order to furnish the bread necessary to celebrate Holy Communion the world over. Nor is the bread one qualitatively. Some may use bread prepared from wheat flour, others may use rye or barley or maize flour. The bread may be baked of hard or soft wheat, spring or winter wheat, American or European or Asiatic grain; it may be baked with yeast or some other fermenting agent or without any kind of ferment. Hence the application of this pas-

sage frequently made, from the days of Augustine, that similarly to the bread, which is one, though composed of many kernels of grain, the Church is one, though composed of many members, is not in keeping with the thought carried out here by the apostle.

The bread in the Lord's Supper is one in a higher sense than that of material unity. It is one in a sense altogether unique, in a manner occurring only in the Sacrament, one in a sacramental sense, incomprehensible to human reason. The bread blessed, distributed, and eaten in the Lord's Supper according to Christ's command and promise, no matter what its material and physical nature may be, is, whenever, wherever, and by whomsoever eaten, always, at all times, and in all places wherever the Lord's Supper as instituted by Him is being celebrated *one* bread, always the same, the bread that is the communion of the body of Christ. There is not one kind of bread given to Christians, another to hypocrites, not one kind for the wise and thoroughly indoctrinated members, another for such as are children in knowledge, not one for the strong in faith, another for the weak; no, all communicants partake of one and the same bread whether they commune in a palatial church edifice or in a rude log hut, whether in civilized countries or in savage surroundings. There is *one* bread, the "fellowship of the body of Christ," mediating, offering, conveying, giving, to all communicants not bread only but together with it the body of Him who died for us that we might have eternal life through faith in Him. The same, of course, holds true of the cup, the wine, the communion of the blood of Christ. Nor does each communicant receive a different body or a different portion or parcel of the one body of Christ; no, though each one receives a different portion of bread, yet in the Sacrament there is only one bread, and that one bread is the communion not only of a part of Christ's body but of the body of Christ, which is one. How is that possible? Answer: That is not for us to ask. With God nothing is impossible, and His word and promise remains true in spite of all cavils and argumentations of human reason, which is wise in its own conceits. We are, thank God, "wise men," v.15, taught of God, John 6:45, to cast down imaginations, etc., 2 Cor. 10:5.

Because there is one bread, one body the many we are. What is meant by the "body"? Again opinions differ. Some hold it to be the body of Christ, with which we are united in a mystical manner in the Lord's Supper and of which we form the members. Then the apostle would have written, His body we are, or Christ's body, or *the* body, or at least, one body with Him. But He writes "one body," without adding any further attribute. A large number of interpreters maintain that here unity of membership in the visible Church is meant. That does not seem to be the true sense

of the words. The apostle no longer speaks in a general manner, as he did in v. 16, where he makes the general statement that the cup and the bread are the communion of the blood and body of Christ. This union is altogether independent of the faith or unbelief of the participant. In v. 17 we have not only a general statement; we are not told that the bread in the Eucharist joins all participants into one body. That is true only of those whom the apostle addresses as "we." He has in mind only those who like him are believing followers of the Lord, worthy communicants, those whom he calls "my dearly beloved," v. 14, "brethren," 10:1; 11:2; who with him are followers of Christ, 11:1; wise men, 10:15; enlightened and enriched by the grace of God, 1:4, 5; who, in spite of all their failings and shortcomings, were sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints, 1:2. These, and such only, receive the full benefit of the Supper. Unworthy communicants, though receiving the body and blood, eat and drink damnation, judgment, unto themselves, 11:27 ff. But when the apostle wrote v. 16, he thought of unbelievers as little as in 1 Cor. 15:20 ff. In both instances "all" refers only to all believers.

We are all partakers of that one bread. In Corinth there were divisions among the members of the congregation, 1 Cor. 11:18; cp. 1:11, 12, and therefore unjustified and unjustifiable distinctions were being made between the members attending the so-called *agapae*, and there existed a great difference in the quality and quantity of foods served on these occasions. There were some who feasted regally and excessively until they were surfeited and intoxicated, while others had little or nothing wherewith to satisfy their hunger, 11:21. The *agape* was a man-made supper, originally serving a noble purpose, that of knitting the hearts closer in brotherly love and affection. Yet the very ones who had instituted these suppers vitiated them, changed them into clannish affairs, whereby outward differences and distinctions, instead of being obliterated, were emphasized and intensified and which caused quarrelings and strifes, until they threatened to disrupt the congregation and divide it into factions warring against one another.

Altogether different is the nature of the Supper instituted by the Lord Jesus. There all are partakers of that one bread blessed by the Lord to be the communion of His body. Though John had the seat of honor, though he and Peter and James were the three disciples closest to the Lord, yet they received no better food than the humblest and least known of the Twelve. Each one was given the same bread, the same cup, and to each one was communicated by that bread the selfsame body and by that cup the selfsame blood that all the others received.

Moreover, because there was one bread and all were partakers

of that one bread, they, the many, were one body. One body they were not only externally, because they had agreed to form a society, or community, for themselves; they were one body spiritually, one in heart and mind and soul, Acts 4:32. Intimately united by the bond of a common faith in the common Savior, this unity, this fellowship, was strengthened and fostered by the one bread and the one cup in the Sacrament, communicating to them the body and the blood given for them for the remission of their sins, nourishing and strengthening their faith, increasing and intensifying their love, uniting them ever closer into one body. That is not only a sentimental ideal, not merely a beautiful vision of an idle dreamer, that is, in spite of all appearances to the contrary, an actual fact. The apostle does not here admonish to unity of spirit, he does not merely hold the ideal of unity before them as the unattained goal for which they must strive. He announces the community of saints as a reality, an accomplished fact. We, the many, are one body. And the proof? One bread there is, we are partakers of that one bread; therefore we are one body. That is God's logic. That is God's judgment. God regards His Christians, though many, as one body. He calls them so. Therefore they are in fact and in truth one body.

We, the many, differing so completely in so many respects that it seems impossible that people so diametrically opposite as to character, nationality, culture, in fact, all outward criteria, should ever become partners, fellows, united into one body, yet by the omnipotent grace and wisdom of God are made *one* through that one bread. Paul, born and reared within the Church of God, and the Corinthians, formerly aliens from the commonwealth of Israel and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and being without God in the world; Paul, the strict Pharisee, Acts 26:4, 5, and the Corinthians, once steeped in shame and vice, 1 Cor. 6:9-12, yet now one body because they were all partakers of that one bread. We, the many, impetuous Peter and meditative John and cautious Thomas; youthful Timothy, Acts 16:1, and aged Mnason, Acts 21:16; Grandmother Lois, 2 Tim. 1:5, and the four virgin daughters of Philip, Acts 21:8; all united into one body through the Holy Eucharist. We, the many, Mary, the well-to-do house-owner, Acts 12:12, and Rhoda, the humble doorkeeper, v. 13; unlearned and ignorant men, Acts 4:13; 1 Cor. 1:26 ff., and cultured Dionysius the Areopagite, Acts 17:34; Aquila and Priscilla, the tentmakers, Acts 18:2, and Simon, the tanner, Acts 10:6; Luke, the beloved physician, Co. 4:14, and the unnamed jailer at Philippi, Acts 16:23 ff.; Lydia, a seller of purple, Acts 16:14, and Phebe, the deaconess, Rom. 16:1; Nicodemus, the Rabbi, John 3:1, and Onesimus, the runaway slave, Philemon 10; James, the apostle,

and Joseph, the councilor, Luke 23:50, 51; many indeed opposites, yet in fact all one body. At the altar of God there is neither Jew nor Greek, neither bond nor free, neither male nor female; they are all one in Christ Jesus, for they are all partakers of that one bread. And since that one bread is still being eaten, the one cup still being drunk in the twentieth century; since the same Supper of our Lord by His command is being served until the Lord Himself will come to seat us at His heavenly table, we, the many, living in the twentieth century, and all the many that will live until the end of time and partake of the one bread and the one cup, form one body with all that have eaten of that bread and drunk of that cup in years past. The saints above and the saints below but one communion make. That congregation of just men made perfect, Heb. 12, already enjoying the inheritance of the saints in light, Col. 1:12, and we, the called saints of God, still waging the battle of faith, still running the race set before us, still keeping under our body and bringing it into subjection,—one body, one in faith, one by the Word, one by Baptism, one by the one bread of which we all have partaken or are still partaking. What a miracle of divine wisdom and power and grace!

In preaching on this text, the pastor may follow the apostle's line of thought and warn against the many forms of idolatry in vogue today, covetousness, belly service, worldliness, exaltation of reason, science, etc., over the Bible, etc. *Flee Idolatry*. It renders impossible the participation at the Lord's Table; it disrupts fellowship with the saints.—The doctrinal content of the passage may be brought out in various ways. *The Lord's Supper in Truth a Communion*. It communicates to us the Lord's body and blood. It unites us into one body.—*The Purpose of the Lord's Supper*. It strengthens our faith in the vicarious atonement. It increases our love to the brethren.—*Worthy Reception of Holy Communion* involves 1) worshipful gratitude toward Christ, 2) fervent love toward the brethren.—*The Confessional Character of the Lord's Supper*. We confess our faith in the vicarious atonement. We confess our fellowship with the brethren.—Just prior to the Communion we sing the *Ter Sanctus*. *The Glory of God as Manifested in the Sacrament*. Here mysteriously the body and blood are communicated to us. Here incomprehensibly we are united into one body.

TH. LAETSCH

Evil Spirits

In classical usage the diminutive form δαϊμόνιον is used synonymously and interchangeably with the noun δαίμων. Originally it was merely the neuter of the adjective "divine," referring to godlike "divine power." The noun δαίμων occurs but once in the New Testament (according to the best texts), viz., in Matt. 8:31, οἱ δαίμονες.

In mythology it gradually came to denote an inferior divinity, or a demon. It still has this connotation in Acts 17:18, where some of the Epicureans and Stoics suspect Paul of proclaiming ξένα δαιμόνια, i. e., strange (foreign, outlandish, un-Greek, hence barbarian) gods to them. Luther must have felt the former force of the word when he first translated "*seltsame Goetter*," instead of his later "*neue Goetter*."

1 Cor. 10:20-22 is somewhat of a *locus classicus* of this meaning, where δαίμονις is used in its Old Testament connotation of heathen deities, false gods, as in Deut. 32:17, ἔθυσαν δαιμονίοις καὶ οὐ θεῷ, *et al.* Strong words are those employed by St. Paul, terrible in their implications: κοινωνοὺς τῶν δαιμονίων, ποτήριον δαιμονίων, and τραπέζης δαιμονίων, the communion of demons, the cup of demons, and the demons' table, condemnatory concepts to make any Christian's soul shudder with horror. The Revelation of St. John also speaks of demon-worship and idolatry in one and the same breath: ἵνα μὴ προσκυνήσουσιν τὰ δαιμόνια καὶ τὰ εἰδῶλα τὰ χρυσᾶ . . . ἀργυρᾶ . . . χαλκᾶ . . . λίθινα . . . ξύλινα (9:20).

In the Scriptures these δαίμονια are spirits consistently characterized as evil. This *usus loquendi* is in contrast to extra-Biblical usage, where *demons* may be used of good and bad spirits alike. The New Testament has no such word as εὐδαιμονεῖν or its cognates, so prevalent in pagan speech. The believer's sole source of happiness and blessedness is the one true God, and Jesus Christ whom He hath sent, never any inferior god of man's fertile and evil imagination; for He alone is ὁ μακάριος Θεός.

That the word "demons" designates spirit-beings is amply demonstrated by its synonymity with τὰ πνεύματα (Luke 9:20: τὸ δαιμόνιον . . . τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἀκαθάρτῳ; also 10:17, 20: τὰ δαιμόνια . . . τὰ πνεύματα), denoting unholy and unclean spirits, evil in their nature and action on men and women. In the New Testament these spirits are frankly credited with causing such ailments as are often baffling to, and beyond the ordinary reach of, medical science to this day, e. g., lunacy and epilepsy. (Cp. Matt. 17:15, 18: ὅτι σεληνάζεται καὶ κακῶς ἔχει· πολλάκις γὰρ πίπτει εἰς τὸ πῦρ καὶ πολλάκις εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ. . . . Καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ τὸ δαιμόνιον.) There are deaf and dumb demons, the same are often the very cause of

these trying afflictions: τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἀκαθάρτῳ . . . τὸ ἄλλον καὶ κωφὸν πνεῦμα (Mark 9:25); προσήνεγκαν αὐτῷ κωφὸν δαμονιζόμενον. Καὶ ἐκβλήθέντος τοῦ δαμονίου ἐλάλησεν ὁ κωφός (Matt. 9:32, 33).

The devils (demons) indeed believe that there is one God, and they quiver in abject fear (τὰ δαμόνια πιστεύουσιν καὶ φρίσσουσιν, Jas. 2:19); it is that same fear which caused them to cry out and acknowledge that Jesus is His Son, Matt. 8:29. There is, then, and it is terrible to contemplate, a demoniac fear of God. The Scriptures everywhere regard these evil spirits as opposed to God and all His works.

As evil in general has its instigator, so the demons have their leader and ruler over them, none other than Βεεζεβοῦλ, ἄρχων τῶν δαμονίων (Matt. 12:24, 27); which is another of the evil works and offices of Satan.

A study of the New Testament references to spirits and demons yields a peculiar fact: The adjective ἀκάθαρτος (unclean, impure) is not employed in the gospels except as a description of spirits; in Acts only once in another connection, and in other places the term is practically entirely restricted to this modification. "Evil spirits," πνευμάτων πονηρῶν, Luke 7:21, presents no difficulties; nor is it hard to understand the fact that some are more evil, πνεύματα πονηρότερα, than others (Matt. 12:45; Luke 11:26); but why "unclean"?

This nomenclature no doubt harks back to the impure and unclean spirit of idolatry. To the ennobled and regenerated Christian soul, uncleanness was inseparable from the pagans' worship of their lesser divinities, or demons, both from a physical and psychical point of view. This is echoed by an emphatic longer descriptive phrase, occurring once only, and this in Luke 4:33: πνεῦμα δαμονίου ἀκαθάρτου. This phrase is all-comprehensive, and the sometimes cynical but celebrated Gibbon has correctly described the situation in *Decline and Fall*, Vol. 1, p. 523:

"It was the universal sentiment, both of the Church and of heretics, that the demons were the authors, the patrons, and the objects of idolatry. Those rebellious spirits who had been degraded from the rank of angels and cast down into the infernal pit were still permitted to roam upon earth, to torment the bodies and seduce the minds of sinful men. The demons soon discovered and abused the natural propensities of the human heart toward devotion, and artfully withdrawing the adoration of mankind from their Creator, they usurped the place and honors of the Supreme Deity. By the success of their malicious contrivances they at once gratified their own vanity and revenge and obtained the only comfort of which they were yet susceptible—the hope of involving the human species in the participation of their guilt and misery."

Edward Gibbon here expresses the view of the early Church as to the identity of the demons, which agrees with the teachings of Scripture. Some commentators have gone to great length in differentiating between these evil spirits and the fallen angels. Maitland, in his essay *False Worship*, makes a fine distinction as between the demons and their arch-demon, the devil; neither will he identify them with the angels that sinned (2 Pet. 2:4). They, he suggests, are not free to enter and possess, δαμονίζειν (demonize), human bodies, because they are in Tartarus, chained in darkness unto judgment, being indeed the imprisoned spirits of 1 Pet. 3:19. With reference to the LXX reading of οἱ ἄγγελοι τοῦ θεοῦ in Gen. 6:2 (Cod. Alexandrinus rescriptor) and the view that it is these that Peter has reference to, he deems it possible to identify the demons of the Bible with the disembodied spirits of the "mighty men who were of old," the issue of the unequal union between the sons of God and the daughters of men. The adjective ἀκάθαρτος would thus describe their mixed nature, partly human, partly angelic. He points to St. Paul's use of this very modifier when discussing the issue of mixed marriages, 1 Cor. 7:14. That Maitland errs in holding that the fallen angels cannot leave Tartarus may be inferred from Luke 8:31 (ἄβυσσος=Τάρταρος).

The gospels have more frequently δαμονιζεσθαι, to be possessed by, or under the power of, a demon; always for an ill purpose. Thus, viewed in the light of God's Word, Spiritism and related occult systems are clearly recognizable as prohibited dealings with the demons and their dictator, the devil. Consequently, those few inexplicable phenomena that men meet with in the realm of the occult and spiritistic, in soothsaying, clairvoyancy, sorcery, Christian Science, Vedanta, etc., plainly come under the apostle's warning when he speaks of those who προσέχοντες πνεύμασιν πλάνοις καὶ διδασκαλίαις δαμονίων, 1 Tim. 4:1, thus recognizing their demoniac power to influence the thoughts and opinions of fickle men.

There never has been any rescission of the numerous and prohibitory warnings of Moses, as in Lev. 19:31; Deut. 13:1-3; 18:10-12, and others.

Let Christians be on their guard lest they be drawn into the haunts and companionship of modern demon-worshipers, not even by curiosity or "for the fun of it." The divine directive of the one true God still stands: "And when they shall say unto you, Seek unto them that have familiar spirits and unto wizards that peep and mutter—should not a people seek unto their God?" Is. 8:19.

Van Nuys, Calif.

R. T. DU BRAU

Predigtentwürfe für die Evangelien der Thomaeus- Perikopenreihe

Palmsonntag

Joh. 12, 1—19

In dieser Woche werden wir das bittere Leiden unsers Herrn Jesu noch ganz besonders betrachten; vgl. Mark. 10, 33. 34. Ehe aber dies alles geschah, durfte Jesus noch einmal erfahren, wie die Seinen ihm dienten. Wir betrachten,

Wie fromme Christen ihrem Heilande dienen

1. Sie hören sein Wort und glauben an ihn
2. Sie breiten seinen Namen aus
3. Sie tun Werke der Liebe und Barmherzigkeit

1

Jesus kam gen Bethania, wo Lazarus und seine Schwestern wohnten. Er hatte Lazarus vom Tode erweckt. Als das Volk erfuhr, daß er bei dessen Grab war, gingen viele dahin, v. 9. Sie wollten Jesum sehen und hören. Und sie glaubten an ihn. Das ist frommer Christen Art. Sie hören Jesu Wort und glauben, daß er Gottes Sohn und der Heiland der Sünder ist. Seine Wunder und seine Predigt beweisen es. So soll es bei Christen sein. Der Vater im Himmel fordert, daß die Menschen das Wort seines Sohnes hören sollen, 5 Mos. 18, 15. Wie oft fordert Jesus das Volk auf, das Wort des Heils, das er predigte, zu hören! Joh. 10, 27; 8, 51; 5, 24 usw. Der Heiland verheißt denen, die an ihn glauben, Leben und Seligkeit, Joh. 3, 16; 7, 37; 11, 25. 26 usw.

Das Volk ging hin, wo Jesus predigte. Christen sollen sich da finden, wo Jesu Wort erschallt, wo der Heiland durch seine Prediger redet, Luk. 10, 16. — Freilich, wer Jesu Wort hört und an ihn glaubt, der wird die Feindschaft der Welt erfahren. Die Hohenpriester ärgerten sich darüber, daß das Volk an Jesum glaubte. Sie wollten sogar Lazarus töten, v. 10. 11. — Die Welt verachtet die Predigt des Wortes Gottes. Sie spottet über die, welche zur Kirche gehen, das Wort hören und an Jesum glauben. Oftmals zeigt sie offen ihre bittere Feindschaft und greift zu Gewaltmitteln (Christenverfolgungen). Aber fromme Christen lassen sich diese Feindschaft nicht zu sehr anfechten. Nach wie vor hören sie sein Wort, Ps. 26, 8, lassen sich in ihrem Glauben an ihn nicht irremachen und führen ihm zu Ehren einen guten Wandel „unter den Heiden“.

2

v. 12—15. Alles Volk erfuhr nun, daß Jesus der König Israels, Gottes Sohn und der Welt Heiland sei. Das gefällt dem Heiland, wenn

Chriften seinen Namen bekennen, Matth. 16, 16. 17; 10, 32. Er hat befohlen, daß sie seinen Namen ausbreiten sollen, Matth. 28, 19.

Auch wir sollen dem Heiland so dienen. Wir preisen Jesum durch unsere Loblieder und Gebete; auch durch ein frommes Leben, Matth. 5, 16. Oft haben wir im Gespräch mit andern Leuten Gelegenheit, Jesu Namen zu bekennen; wir breiten seinen Namen aus, wenn wir uns eifrig am Werke der Mission beteiligen. — Auch hier stoßen Christen auf Widerspruch, B. 19. Viele ärgern sich daran, daß Christus als der alleinige Heiland der Welt gepredigt wird; sie wollen lieber eine Religion, die lehrt, daß der Mensch so, wie er ist, gut genug ist, in den Himmel einzugehen. Oft gibt es selbst Glieder in der Gemeinde, die kein Interesse für die Mission zeigen. Es liegt ihnen nichts daran, den Heiden das Heil in Christo zu verkündigen. Wir aber wollen dem Heiland so dienen, daß wir ihn preisen und seinen Namen ausbreiten.

3

Endlich sehen wir, wie Maria dem Heiland durch ein Liebeswerk diente, B. 3. Jesus hatte großes Wohlgefallen daran, B. 7. 8. Das Gute, das wir unsern Mitmenschen erweisen, tun wir dem Heiland, Matth. 25, 40. Die Schrift ermahnt uns, Liebeswerke zu tun, Jes. 58, 7; Hebr. 13, 16; Röm. 12, 20. Christen helfen den Armen, den Waisen, ja allen, die in Not geraten. — Wohl gibt es auch hier Hindernisse, B. 4. 5. Judas tadelte Maria; er nennt heuchlerischerweise ihr Liebeswerk Verschwendung, B. 6. So gibt es auch jetzt viele Menschen, die nichts davon hören wollen, daß man Werke der Barmherzigkeit tun soll. Doch Christen wissen, daß sie durch solche Werke dem Heilande dienen, Matth. 25, 40.

In der Passionszeit hören wir viel von Jesu Leiden und Sterben für uns arme Sünder. Das soll uns bewegen, dem Heiland zu dienen, Luf. 1, 74. 75, und zwar dadurch, daß wir sein Wort hören und glauben, daß wir seinen Namen preisen und ausbreiten und daß wir Werke der Liebe tun.

J. Niedner

Gründonnerstag

Luf. 22, 14—23

Die herrlichen Gnadenmittel, die wir genießen, sind von Christo selbst eingesetzt. Er hat die Kirche beauftragt, das Evangelium zu predigen, Matth. 28, 19; Mark. 16, 15. Er hat den Taufbefehl gegeben. Er hat das heilige Abendmahl eingesetzt und seiner Kirche gesagt: „Solches tut!“ Nur weil er uns diesen Auftrag gegeben hat, predigen wir und verwalten die Sakramente. Aber weil er den Befehl gegeben hat, ist auch die Verwaltung der Gnadenmittel so gültig.

An diesem Tage gedenken wir der Einsetzung des heiligen Abendmahls. Wie hochwichtig sollte uns dieser Tag sein!

Die feierliche Einfehung des heiligen Abendmahls

1. Bei welcher Gelegenheit diefe Einfehung ge-
ſchah
2. Welch ein wunderbares Sakrament der Herr
damit eingefekt hat

1

Jeſus und feine Jünger feierten das Paſſahmahl, B. 14. Die Stunde, für die Jeſus als Hausvater der Jüngerschar Vorfehrungen getroffen hatte, Luk. 22, 8—13; die Stunde, nach der ihn herzlich verlangt hatte, B. 15; die Stunde, in der er zum leßtenmal feine zwölf Apoftel bei ſich hatte, B. 14. Welch ernſte, bedeutungsvolle Stunde! Welch feierliche Stunde!

Jeſus ſagte zu ſeinen Jüngern: B. 15. Das Paſſahlamn, das die Jünger an die Erlöſung aus Ägypten erinnerte, war ein Vorbild des rechten Erlöſers und ſeines großen Errettungswerkes. Nun war die Zeit gekommen, da dieſes Vorbild ſeinen Zweck völlig erfüllt hatte, und daher war es nicht mehr nötig. „Ehe denn ich ſterbe“ ſollte ſich ſchon am nächſten Tage erfüllen. Gerade dieſes Paſſahmahl, das letzte, das er mit ſeinen Jüngern feiern würde, B. 16. 18, war von beſonderer Bedeutung für Jeſum, „weil dieſes Mahl zu ſeinem Leiden und Sterben überleiten ſollte“. (Stöckhardt, Bibl. Geſch. d. N. T., S. 265.)

Auch für die Jünger war dieſe eine unvergeßliche Stunde. In jener Nacht, in der Stille vor dem hereinbrechenden Sturm, konnten ſie noch einmal von der Bedeutung des Paſſahmahls hören. Und wie ernſt redete doch Jeſus mit ihnen, ſchon bei der Fußwaſchung und jezt wieder bei der Paſſahmahlzeit! Wie ernſtlich warnte er ſeinen Verräter! B. 21—23. Wie hätten dieſe Worte dem Judas wie ein Schwert durch die Seele fahren ſollen! Judas war bei der Feier des Paſſahfeſtes zugegen. „Die Hand meines Verräters iſt mit mir über Tiſch“, B. 21. Daß er bei der Feier des Abendmahls noch zugegen war, iſt wohl kaum anzunehmen; vgl. Matth. 26, 21—25; Mark. 14, 18—21; Joh. 13, 29—30. (Siehe auch Stöckhardt, a. a. O., S. 266.)

2

Nach Vollendung des Paſſahmahls, vor den erſtaunten Jüngern, reichte der Heiland noch einmal Brot und Wein. Er, der nun als rechtes Lamm Gottes für uns leiden und ſterben wollte, wollte in ſeinem Teſtament, B. 20, ſeinen Jüngern, ſeiner Kirche, die Frucht ſeines Leidens vermachern. (Stöckhardt, a. a. O., S. 266.)

„Das iſt mein Leib“ uſw.; „Das iſt der Kelch, das Neue Teſtament in meinem Blut“ uſw. Jeſu Leib und Blut iſt das herrliche Gut, das uns unter dem geſegneten Brot und Wein im Abendmahl gereicht wird. „Mein Leib, der für euch gegeben wird“, „in meinem Blut, das

für euch vergossen wird“. Das kann nur der wahre Leib und das wahre Blut Christi sein (nicht „bedeutet“, auch nicht Transsubstantiation). Die Worte reden von einem gewaltfamen Tode, vom Tode am Kreuz. „Zur Vergebung der Sünden“, Matth. 26, 28. Christi Leib und Blut bekräftigen und versiegeln die Vergebung unserer Sünden, machen uns der Vergebung gewiß, stärken somit unsern Glauben an die Vergebung der Sünden, geben uns daher Kraft zu neuem, gottesfürchtigem Leben. Welch ein herrliches Gut bringt uns Christi Testament!

Unsere Vernunft kann das nicht begreifen und verstehen. Es geht ihr hier wie auch bei sonstigen Glaubenslehren. Aber die Worte Christi sind klar, 8. 19. 20. Und wir glauben diesen Worten und danken Gott für dieses teure, gnadenbringende, gnadenversiegelnde Sakrament.

„Das tut zu meinem Gedächtnis“, 8. 19. Wir sollen des Todes Jesu und alles dessen, was damit verbunden ist, gedenken. Gebrauchen wir dieses Gnadenmittel so fleißig, wie wir sollten? Erkennen wir, wie nötig wir es haben? Wissen wir, welch ein Segen uns da angeboten und dargereicht wird? (Lied 202, 8. 9.) J. W. Behnen

Karfreitag

Joh. 19, 28—30

Am Karfreitag wandern alle Christen im Geist nach Golgatha und versammeln sich unter dem Kreuz ihres Heilandes; denn sie wissen, daß dort der Kampf Jesu für ihre Seelen seinen Höhepunkt erreichte. Schon in Gethsemane war seine Seele betrübt bis an den Tod. Auf Golgatha aber war der Erlöser unter dem Fluch der Verdammnis, die er anstatt aller Menschen auf sich genommen hatte, so daß er sogar von seinem himmlischen Vater verlassen war. — Aber er erlag nicht in dem furchtbaren Kampfe, trotzdem sich aus seinem gequälten Herzen der Schrei herausrang: „Mein Gott, mein Gott, warum hast du mich verlassen?“ Golgatha zeigt uns die entsetzliche Macht der Sünde, aber auch den Sieg über Sünde, Tod und Teufel.

„Es ist vollbracht!“

1. Die Schrift ist erfüllt
2. Das Werk der Erlösung ist zum Abschluß gekommen

1

a. „Daß die Schrift erfüllet würde“, 8. 28b. Das war der Grundton in dem ganzen Leben, Leiden und Sterben Jesu, daß die Schrift des Alten Testaments erfüllt würde, in der nicht nur in der dritten Person von ihm die Rede ist, wie in Jes. 53, sondern er auch selber redend auftritt, wie in Ps. 22 und öfter. Daß der Heiland am

Kreuze Dürft Leiden würde, hatte er ſelber Pf. 22, 16 geweißagt; vgl. Pf. 69, 22.

b. Die altteſtamentliche Weiſſagung ging wörtlich in Erfüllung, wie das in unſerm Text geſchildert wird; vgl. Matth. 27, 48; Mark. 15, 36. Auch dieſer Teil ſeines Leidens hat ſich nach Gottes vorbedachtem Rat vollzogen. Es war nichts von ohngefähr, nichts Zufälliges, in dem Leiden unſers Heilandes.

c. Weil Jeſus wußte, daß ſchon alles vollbracht war, ging auch in dieſem Teil ſeines Erlösungswerkes die Schrift in Erfüllung, wie denn während der letzten vierundzwanzig Stunden ſeines Lebens mehr als ein Duzend Weiſſagungen erfüllt wurden. Wir werden hier an die Thatſache erinnert, daß die Schrift die Grundlage für unſere Erlösungshoffnung iſt. Unſer Glaube ruht nicht auf menſchlichen Meinungen und Vermutungen, ſondern auf dem untrüglichen Wort Gottes. Das gilt beſonders auch von der Geſchichte des Leidens und Sterbens unſers Heilandes. Darum können wir heute in zuverſichtlichem Glauben ſprechen: „Es iſt vollbracht!“

2

a. Wie Jeſus zu Anfang ſeines Leidens am Kreuze das übliche Befäubungsmittel zurückwies, weil er die Schmerzen erdulden wollte, die er an unſerer Statt auf ſich genommen hatte, ſo wollte er jezt, als er ſeine Seele in die Hände ſeines himmliſchen Vaters geben wollte, erquickt und geſtärkt dem Tode ins Auge ſchauen. Alle prophetiſchen Ausſagen, die auf ſein Leiden Bezug nahmen, waren erfüllt, und im Bewußtſein ſeines vollen Sieges über alle Feinde ſchickte ſich der Heiland an, mit ſeinem Tode ſein Erlösungswerk zu krönen.

b. Somit war das Wort des Heilandes „Es iſt vollbracht!“ ein Siegesruf. Was ſchon vor Gründung der Welt im Rat des dreieinigen Gottes beſchloſſen war, Joh. 3, 16, was der Heiland durch ſeine Menſchwerdung, durch ſein Leben, Leiden und Sterben hatte bewerkſtelligen wollen, das war jezt vollbracht. Er hatte alle Gerechtigkeit an unſerer Statt erfüllt, er hatte das ganze Geſetz an unſerer Statt gehalten. Und er wurde jezt als das Lamm Gottes, das der Welt Sünde trägt, am Stamm des Kreuzes geſchlachtet. Er, der zugleich der Hoheprieſter und das rechte einige Paſſahlamm iſt, hat ſein Blut für uns vergoſſen, ſein Leben für uns in den Tod gegeben. Er hat damit der Gerechtigkeit Gottes vollkommene Genüge geleiſtet, ſo daß nun die Welt mit Gott verſöhnt iſt, 2 Kor. 5, 19—21.

c. Und damit iſt der Siegesruf des Heilandes unſer Siegesruf geworden, weil er eben als unſer Stellvertreter ſein Leben in den Tod gegeben hat. Wer an ihn glaubt, ſoll nicht verloren werden, ſondern das ewige Leben haben. Nehmen wir doch ja das vollgültige Opfer unſers Heilandes an!

P. E. K r e z m a n n

Osterfonntag

Matth. 28, 1—10

Pf. 118, 15. 16. 22. 23. Das ist das Wunder aller Wunder, daß einer in eigener Kraft von den Toten aufersteht. Wie nun die Auferstehung Christi selbst, so sind auch ihre Wirkungen höchst wunderbar.

Die wunderbaren Wirkungen der Auferstehung Jesu Christi

1. Die ungläubigen Feinde werden darüber mit Schrecken erfüllt
2. Die Freunde aber erfüllt sie mit Glauben und Freude

1

a. V. 1—4. V. 1 eigentlich „nach dem Sabbat“, als das Licht am folgenden Tag hervorzu leuchten begann. Also früh am Sonntagmorgen gingen die Frauen zum Grabe, Matth. 16, 1; Luk. 24, 10. Sie wollten das Grab besehen und dann den Leib des geliebten Meisters noch besser einbalsamieren. Aber schon ehe sie in die Nähe des Grabes gekommen waren, war etwas höchst Wunderbares im Grabe geschehen. Jesus, getötet nach dem Fleisch, wurde lebendig nach dem Geist, 1 Petr. 3, 18. 19; Apost. 2, 24. Welcher Schrecken in der Hölle — Aber auch auf Erden sollten Jesus Feinde bei seiner Auferstehung erschrecken. „Siehe, es geschah ein groß Erdbeben.“ Für die Kriegsknechte, die bei dem Grabe Wache halten sollten, war das große Erdbeben schrecklich. Sie zitterten und bebten aber auch aus Furcht vor dem Engel des Herrn, der vom Himmel gekommen war, V. 2. 3. Er fragte nicht lange, ob er den Stein anrühren, das kaiserliche Siegel zerbrechen dürfe. Im Nu hatte er den Stein weggewälzt und setzte sich darauf. Er war nun der Wächter, und jeder konnte sehen, daß das Grab leer war. Das war zu viel für diese wetterharten römischen Soldaten, die sonst keine Furcht kannten. Sie fielen um und lagen da wie tot. Als sie wieder zum Bewußtsein gekommen waren und noch immer den Engel dastehen sahen, als das geöffnete, leere Grab sie anstarrte, da liefen sie davon. Etliche brachten den Hohenpriestern die Schreckensbotschaft, V. 11. Was diese befürchtet und zu verhindern versucht hatten, war nun zu ihrem Grausen doch geschehen. Jesus ist stärker als sie alle. Er ist des Lebendigen Gottes Sohn. O wie wird sein Zorn über sie entbrennen!

b. So erfüllt die Auferstehung Christi alle Feinde seines Wortes mit Schrecken. Denn ist Jesus auferstanden, wie sie das nicht wegleugnen können, dann bricht ihr Unglaube zusammen, dann ist Jesus Gottes Sohn, aller Welt und auch ihr einziger Heiland, dann ist das Wort in seinem Munde Wahrheit, gerade auch das Wort „Wer nicht glaubet, der wird verdammt“. Ja, wie schrecklich, wenn Menschen sich in ihrem Unglauben verhärten, zu Lügen greifen und schließlich in ihrem

Unglauben sterben! Sie werden einst den Auferstandenen sehen in den Wolken des Himmels mit allen seinen heiligen Engeln, Matth. 24, 30; Offenb. 6, 15—17.

2

a. B. 5—10. Mittlerweile waren die Frauen, die treuen Freundinnen des Herrn, in die Nähe des Grabes gekommen. Auf einmal sind sie bekümmert wegen des großen Steins. An die Wache haben sie wohl nicht gedacht, vielleicht nicht einmal etwas davon gewußt. Als sie nun beim Hellertwerden zum Grabe hinschauen, sehen sie schon aus der Ferne, daß der große Stein weggewälzt ist, Mark. 16, 3. 4; Joh. 20, 1. 2. Sie gehen, wenn auch sehr bestürzt, immer näher. Der Engel, der erst auf dem Stein gesessen hat, hat sich wohl in die Grabeshöhle zurückgezogen, und ein zweiter hat sich ihm zugesellt, Luk. 24, 3. 4. Die Frauen treten in das Grab. Es ist leer. Sie können es nicht verstehen. Da sehen sie auf einmal zu ihrem neuen Entsetzen die Engel in glänzenden Kleidern. Sie sind geblendet, zum Tode erschrocken. Aber der Engel, dessen Erscheinung die Hüter so erschreckt hatte, sagt freundlich zu ihnen: B. 5. 6. Er ist wirklich Gottes Sohn. Sein Wort, seine Lehre, ist wahr. Er ist auferweckt worden. Dasselbe Wort hier wie Röm. 4, 25; 6, 4. Der Vater ist zufrieden mit dem Sühnopfer seines Sohnes. Ihr seid völlig erlöst. Ja, lebt er, dann müßt auch ihr leben. Er wird vor euch hingehen in Galiläa, B. 7 b; vgl. Matth. 26, 32. Jetzt aber geht eilend hin und sagt es auch seinen Jüngern, selbst dem Petrus. Siehe, ich, der Vote Gottes, habe es euch gesagt. — Wie die Weiber nun eilends fortgehen, erscheint ihnen plötzlich der Auferstandene selbst, B. 9. Sie überzeugen sich, daß es nicht sein Geist, sondern er selbst leibhaftig sei, und beten ihn an. Er sagt zu ihnen: B. 10. Es ist außer Frage, durch die Auferstehung Jesu Christi sind jene Frauen und alle Jünger und Freunde des Herrn in ihrem Glauben mächtig gestärkt und mit überaus großer Freude erfüllt worden. Ihre Freude übertrug alles vorherige Zittern und Entsetzen.

b. So soll die Auferstehung Christi auch uns heute wieder mit Glauben und großer Freude erfüllen. Sie ist der Grund- und Eckstein unsers Glaubens, unserer Hoffnung. Wie eilend und eifrig sollten nicht auch wir in diesem Jubeljahr andern die Freudenbotschaft von dem Auferstandenen bringen! Und welche Freude, wenn auch uns der Auferstandene einst erscheint, um uns heimzuholen in seine ewige Freude!

J. Roschke

Ostermontag

Joh. 20, 11—18

Die Auferstehung Christi von den Toten ändert alles: 1 Kor. 15, 17. 20 (Glaube); 1 Petr. 1, 3 (Hoffnung); Kol. 3, 2 (Hertz); 2 Kor. 5, 15 (Leben); 1 Kor. 15, 58 (Dienst); Röm. 6, 23 (Sterben); Kol. 3, 3. 4 (Ziel). Bei dem Wechsel vom Bösen zum Guten jubeln wir.

Marias Jubelruf: Meister!

Dieser Jubelruf bringt zum Ausdruck,

1. daß Jesus ihren Zweifel und ihr Elend verschleicht hat
2. daß sie sich mit Freuden in seinen Dienst stellen will

1

Der Blick in das offene Grab. Gegen ihre Erwartung findet Maria das Grab leer. Und doch nicht leer; denn zwei Engel begrüßen sie, himmlische Lebewesen am Ort der Toten. Der Engel frage. Damit schließt dieser Engelsdienst. Jetzt sehen sie nur noch und hören zu. Sie sollten um Marias und um unsertwillen fragen, damit Maria sich ausspricht und wir in ihr und in unser eigenes Herz einen Blick tun. Wir erwarten die Antwort: Ich weine Freudentränen, weil Jesus lebt. Ihre Antwort verrät, daß sie an Zweifel und Unglauben litt. Wie ist das möglich? Sie hat Anfechtungen an diesem offenen Grabe. An ihrer selbstgefachten, nichtigen Meinung liegt es, daß sie Anfechtungen hat, bekümmert ist und Tränen weint. In diesem Zustand erkennt sie Jesum nicht, der doch auch eben jetzt bei ihr war. Auch ihm gegenüber hält sie fest an ihrer eigenen Meinung und beklagt es, daß ihre Hoffnungen nun zertrümmert sind. Armes Weib! — Jesus offenbart sich ihr als der Auferstandene. „Maria!“ Es ist der, der sie liebt, der sie kennt und bei ihrem Namen nennt. „Rabboni!“ Nur weil er sich zu erkennen gibt, erkennt sie ihn. Wie glücklich, wie selig ist sie nun! Ihr Jubelruf bringt zum Ausdruck, daß ihr Zweifel verschleucht ist, ihr Kummer in Freude verwandelt.

Auch wir nennen Jesum unsern Herrn. Wie kommt's? Zur Osterzeit besonders treten wir an Christi leeres Grab. Das leere Grab verkündigt uns das von Jesu erworbene Heil und Leben. Aber wir sind Sünder und gar träge, „zu glauben alle dem“ usw. Wer die wahre Osterbotschaft verwirft oder bezweifelt, der bleibt in seinem Sündenelend. Wir treten an unser eigenes Grab, das schon da ist, aber noch leer. Welche Empfindungen? Regungen des Zweifels oder des Glaubens? Es wäre doch schrecklich, würden wir angesichts des offenen Grabes Christi an unserm noch offenen Grabe Zweifel hegen und in beiden doch den Tod suchen und demgemäß hinleben und hinstirben. Zußt du das? Und willst du bei solcher Meinung bleiben? Von Natur halten wir trotzig fest an unserm Elend, indem wir es durch falsche Hoffnungen abschütteln wollen. Nur Christus, der uns liebt, kennt, nennt, durch sein Wort persönlich zu uns tritt und uns anredet, reißt uns aus der Verblendung und verschleucht Zweifel und Elend. Welche Ermunterung, welcher Trost für uns in seiner gnädigen und geduligen Be-

handlung der Seinen! Die dunkle Herzenskammer wird hell durch sein Wort, das der Glaube ergreift; die trübe Grabeskammer wird licht durch Christi Osterwerk, das die Hoffnung erfasst. Glaube und Hoffnung sind fest gegründet auf die Tatsache, daß der Sohn zum Vater geht, der Fürsprecher vor Gottes Thron, der Bruder voran nach der Heimat droben, der Sieger in sein Reich mit den Seinen. Wir jubeln.

2

Was Maria nicht tun soll. „Nähre mich nicht an!“ Das heißt: Halte dich nicht länger bei mir auf; hänge dich nicht an meine Person. Maria hatte Jesum Meister genannt. Nach morgenländischer Sitte der Untergebenen ist sie dann vor ihn niedergefallen und hat seine Füße umfaßt. Je größer die Freude, desto stärker der Ausdruck derselben. Jesus weist wohl die Berührung ab, aber tröstet sie, daß sie später, wenn er aufgezogen ist, weitere Gelegenheit des Umgangs haben werde. Jetzt aber sagt er ihr, was sie tun soll. Sein Osterfest soll verkündigt werden. Jesu Auftrag an Maria umfaßt die Zeit der Ausführung desselben, die Botschaft selbst und die Empfänger der Botschaft. Nicht weniger, nicht mehr als diesen Dienst erwartet der Herr von seiner Jüngerin; ein ungemein leicht ausführbarer Dienst. — Maria geht, sie redet. Sie ist eine gute, hochgeehrte Botschafterin, weil sie den Auftrag hat, die beste Botschaft, die es gibt, zu verkündigen. Diese war den Jüngern doch so nötig.

Durch den Auftrag weist Jesus die Maria von seiner Person auf sein Amt der Stellvertretung und Fürsprache und dann auf den ihm gefälligen Dienst. Jesu Person ohne sein Erlösungswerk mühte uns verdammen. Seine Person und sein Werk gehören zusammen. Sein Werk muß ergriffen und erfasst werden nicht weniger als seine Person. Unser Text straft den modernen Geist, der Jesum von seinem stellvertretenden Werk trennen will und Jesum preisen ohne Annahme seines Werkes, wie die widerchristlichen Vereine und so viele vorgebliche Osterprediger. Der moderne Geist predigt nur Todesbotschaft.

Wahre Osterchristen sind dem Auferstandenen willig und freudig dienlich. Der von Christo uns aufgetragene Dienst besteht darin, daß wir andern die Lebensbotschaft bringen. Wie leicht ist doch dieser Dienst! Die Menschen, ja auch wir machen ihn uns schwer durch fleischliche Gesinnung, irdische Sorge, Furcht vor der Welt. Ein lazer, schläfriger Dienst paßt gar nicht in unsern Osterjubel, verträgt sich nicht mit der Osterbotschaft, die uns beglückt. Laßt uns wach und wader sein im Dienst des Lebensfürsten, auch in Hinsicht auf die hohe Ehre, als seine Evangelisten das Wort des Lebens der geistlich toten Welt zu verkündigen! So beweisen wir, daß unser Glaube und unser Jubel echt ist.

G. H. Smulal

Quasimodogeniti

Joh. 21, 15—24

Gleich nach den Worten unsers Textes lesen wir: B. 25. — Vorwige Geister sind zugefahren und haben allerlei Geschichten erfunden, die das ergänzen sollten, was hier bloß angedeutet wird. Das ist Sünde und Unfug. Wir sollen unsern Vorwitz zügeln und Gott bitten, daß er uns seinen Heiligen Geist gebe, damit wir gerade das immer besser lernen, was er aus großer Liebe uns kundgetan hat. Wie wichtig ist gerade der vorliegende Text! Er berichtet

Jesu letzte Unterredung mit seinem Jünger Petrus

1. Er unterwirft ihn einer ernststen Prüfung.

a. Petrus hatte sich schwer versündigt. (Verleugnung Christi.) Jesus will ihn anleiten, sich selbst zu prüfen. Alle Worte in unserm Text sind so recht angetan, den Petrus tief in der innersten Seele zu ergreifen. Er nennt ihn nicht Petrus, den Felsenmann, sondern Simon Johanna. Petrus hatte seinen Namen Felsenmann eigentlich verschertzt. Fürwahr, er hatte diese Prüfung sehr nötig. Und die haben auch wir nötig, 1 Kor. 11, 31; 2 Kor. 13, 5.

b. Jesus wiederholt die Frage dreimal. Er ändert die Fassung. Es war wahrlich kein Kinderspiel, sondern eine sehr ernste Prüfung. Wir sollen es ja ernst nehmen mit solcher Prüfung. Dabei sollen wir gerade auf die Hauptsache merken. „Hast du mich lieb?“ Wie beweist du das durch dein Verhalten? Wie oft hast du gegen diese Liebe gesündigt? Gottesdienst versäumt, Gottes Wort heiseteigelassen, Nächstenliebe nicht geübt, 1 Joh. 4, 20. O wie fehlt es da bei uns!

c. Jesus ist der Herzenskündiger. Petrus konnte ihn nicht betrogen. Er war sich dessen wohl bewußt, der Herr weiß, ob ich ihn liebe habe. Daran sollen auch wir denken. Petrus war tief ergriffen, B. 17. Brennt dir auch das Herz?

2. Er gibt dem Petrus einen hochwichtigen Auftrag.

a. „Weide meine Lämmer; weide meine Schafe!“ sagt Jesus zu Petrus. Er hat hier nicht den Petrus zum Papst ernannt, viel weniger den sogenannten Nachfolger Petri. Mit diesen Worten ist nichts anderes gesagt, als was Jesus nachmals auf dem Ölberg allen seinen Jüngern sagte: Matth. 28, 18; Mark. 16, 15. Das ist uns allen gesagt. Jeder Christ hat die Pflicht, je nach seinen Gaben und Gelegenheiten, bei diesem Weiden mitzuwirken.

b. Dazu ist Liebe nötig, herzliche Liebe zu Jesu; denn solches Amt und Werk hat Leiden und Schmach, ja zuweilen selbst den Tod im Gefolge. Wir wollen dieses Auftrags ja eingedenk bleiben. Ach, es fehlt noch viel bei uns!

3. Der Herr erteilt Petrus eine scharfe Zurechtweisung.

B. 20. Da Petrus den Johannes sah, spricht er zu Jesu: B. 21. Anstatt daß er über die Prüfung, die er eben erfahren, und über den Auftrag, den er eben übernommen hatte, ernstlich nachgedacht hätte, kümmert er sich um das, was ihn gar nichts angeht. Da muß ihm freilich Jesus einen scharfen Verweis erteilen. Er sagt zu ihm: B. 22.

Das ist eine nur zu gemeine menschliche Unart, daß man sich um Dinge kümmert, die einen gar nichts angehen, und dabei Pflichten versäumt, die einem so angelegentlich aufgetragen worden sind; vgl. Saul, Abab.

Eifersucht, Mißgunst, Schadenfreude regt sich im Herzen; nur zu oft folgt dann Afterreden und Verleumdung. O wieviel Unheil ist durch diese Sünde angerichtet worden! Man vernachlässigt seine eigenen Pflichten und pfuscht unberufenertweise in anderer Menschen, ja in Gottes Sachen hinein.

Anwendung. Davor wollen wir uns hüten. Das brachte Absalom zu Fall. Wir sind so geneigt zu richten, zu urteilen über Sachen, die wir nicht verstehen, und darüber das zu versäumen, was uns wirklich aufgetragen worden ist und worüber wir einmal zur Rechenschaft gezogen werden.

Schluß. Lieben wir Jesum? Breiten wir sein Wort aus? Hüten wir uns vor Einmischung in Sachen, die uns nichts angehen!
„Jesu, stärke deine Kinder!“ Martin C. Sommer

Misericordias Domini

Joh. 21, 1—14

Der Jünger Arbeit als Menschenfischer, Matth. 4, 19, sollte nun beginnen. Zweck der Erscheinungen des Auferstandenen war, die Jünger für dieses Amt auszurüsten. Amt der Schlüssel, Joh. 20, 22. 23; Luk. 24, 27. In Galiläa, Matth. 28, 7. 16, sollten die Jünger die letzten Anweisungen für ihre große Missionstätigkeit empfangen. Daher werden Petrus besonders, Joh. 21, 15 ff., und die Jünger im Texte für ihre Arbeit ausgerüstet.

Der Herr rüstet seine Jünger für ihre große Missionsarbeit aus

1. Er macht sie seiner Auferstehung felsenfest gewiß.

a. Abermals tritt Christus gleichsam aus seinem Verborgensein hervor, B. 1. 4. Er offenbart sich als derselbe, dem sie während seines irdischen Wandels gefolgt waren, und zwar durch den wunderbaren Fischzug, B. 6 (vgl. Luk. 5, 4), und durch die Speisung, B. 9. 13 (vgl.

Joh. 6, 1 ff.). Der Gekreuzigte steht nun vor ihnen. Jetzt können sie wirklich Zeugen seines Todes und seiner Auferstehung sein, Apost. 3, 15.

b. Ohne Christi Auferstehung gibt es keine Rechtfertigung, keine Absolution, kein Amt der Schlüssel, keine Predigt. Seine Auferstehung verbürgt uns unsere Rechtfertigung, Röm. 4, 25. Im Glauben an die Auferstehung des Gekreuzigten können die Jünger als Gottes Votschafter ihre große Missionsarbeit mit Freuden unternehmen, 2 Kor. 5, 18. 19.

Anwendung. Der Jünger Zeugnis von dem Auferstandenen liegt im Wort der Bibel vor. Da haben wir alles, was nötig ist, unsere Missionsaufgabe hinauszuführen.

2. Er gibt ihnen ein Pfand seiner reichen Gnadengegenwart.

a. Der Herr selbst gibt die Männer zur Missionsarbeit. Petrus und Thomas, der Verleugner und der Zweifler, werden zuerst genannt, V. 2. Der Herr hatte sich ihrer besonders angenommen. Alle Jünger sind einmütig beieinander, V. 3. Aber ein Band, das enger ist als das der Freundschaft, verbindet sie, Apost. 1, 14; 2, 1. So wird der Herr selbst bis ans Ende der Tage die Kräfte zur Missionsarbeit geben, 1 Kor. 12, 28; Eph. 4, 10—12.

b. Vergleiche Armut und Ohnmacht der Jünger mit Größe des Missionswerkes. Die Jünger erkennen ihren Mangel, V. 5. Der Heiland offenbart seine allmächtige (V. 6) und seine reiche Hand (V. 6 b. 11). Wir können getrost das große Werk unternehmen, Matth. 28, 18; Sach. 4, 6.

c. Der Herr mehrt und stärkt den Glauben seiner Jünger. Diese Jünger erkennen zuerst den Heiland nicht. Daran hatte nicht nur die Entfernung und die Morgendämmerung schuld. An seinen Wundern und seiner Rede erkennen sie Christum, V. 12. Obwohl sie seine Wege nicht immer erkennen (vgl. V. 21. 22; Apost. 1, 6. 7), gehen sie freudig ans Werk, Apost. 4, 20; 5, 41. 42. Wir sollen uns mit dem begnügen, was Christus uns in seinem Worte offenbart hat. Da werden wir Christum in seiner Gnadengegenwart immer klarer erkennen.

Anwendung. Wie eifrig sollten wir sein, da wir so wohl ausgerüstet sind für das schwierigste, das größte, aber auch das herrlichste Werk!

F. E. Mayer

Jubilate

Joh. 10, 1—12a

Jesus ist der gute Hirte. Wir denken dabei mit Recht meistens an das Tröstliche, das in diesem Namen liegt. Nach dem Zusammenhang können wir aber auch einem andern Gedankengang folgen. Unsere Textworte waren vornehmlich an Pharisäer gerichtet, die sich an der

Heilung des Blindgeborenen am Sabbat gestoßen hatten, 9, 24. Was tut nun Jesus? Modelt er seine Botschaft um, um sie dem Geschmack der geistigen und geistlichen Führer mundgerecht zu machen? In unserm Text verkündigt er ihnen, ob sie es glauben wollen oder nicht, daß er der einige, wahre Messias und Heiland sei.

In einer ähnlichen Lage sind wir. Die Führer der Welt und auch der äußeren Christenheit verwerfen der großen Mehrzahl nach das Evangelium, und die Menge folgt ihnen nach. Seine Gesetzespredigt lassen sie sich noch einigermaßen gefallen, aber das Evangelium gar nicht. Sollen wir auch in die neumodische Predigt einstimmen?

Wir wollen trotz aller Feindschaft Jesum als den einigen Heiland verkünden

1. Er verdient diesen Namen
2. Alle andern sogenannten Heilande sind Diebe und Mörder

1

Um zu zeigen, was dazu gehört, der Heiland der sündigen Menschheit zu sein, gebraucht der Herr im Text zwei Bilder. Im Unterschied von einem Dieb oder einem Fremden ist er ein Hirt. Dieser geht durch die Tür der Hürde ein, erkennt seine Schafe und ruft sie mit Namen; er geht vor ihnen her, um sie vor Feinden zu schützen und sie auf die rechte Weide und zum frischen Wasser zu führen; er läßt sogar sein Leben für die Schafe.

Daß dieses Bild nur auf Jesum zutrifft, sagt er selbst v. 12. Er ist nicht auf unrechtmäßige Weise, aus eigenem Fürwitz und auf eigenem Wege zu den Schafen gekommen; er ist der von Gott verheißene und gesandte Heiland, wie der Vater bei seiner Taufe, Verkündung, Auferweckung von den Toten bezeugt hat. Er kennt die Seinen genau und gibt sich ihnen durch sein Wort zu erkennen. Er geht ihnen voran, besteht den Angriff aller Feinde und führt sie den rechten Weg. Ja, er bringt sein Leben dar, damit sie nicht eine Beute des höllischen Wolfes werden. Als solch ein Heiland hat er sich gezeigt, als er auf Erden wandelte; als ein solcher hat er sich an unsern Herzen bewiesen.

Weiter nennt der Herr sich die Tür zu den Schafen. Diesen Namen erklärt er v. 9, 11. Wer durch ihn in die Hürde der einen heiligen Kirche eingeht, der wird selig werden, erlangt das Heil, die herrliche Frucht seines stellvertretenden Leidens und Sterbens. Dem wird nichts mangeln; er wird ein und aus gehen und Weide finden; er wird das Leben und volle Genüge haben. Christus schenkt ihm alles, was er zum Heil seiner Seele nötig hat. Darum singen wir: „Weil ich Jesu Schäflein bin“ usw.

Diese Botschaft ist allerdings der Welt ein Ärgernis und eine

Torheit. Aber trotz alledem wollen wir mit den Aposteln das Wort frei verkünden, Apost. 4, 12. Mag diese Botschaft auch der selbstgerechten, tugendstolzen Seele ein Geruch des Todes zum Tode sein, den armen Sündern wird sie ein Geruch des Lebens zum Leben.

2

Der Herr redet in unserm Text nicht nur von sich als dem einigen Heiland, sondern auch von andern. Gerade was er von diesen sagt, soll uns anspornen, ihn zu verkündigen.

Anderer sind mit dem Anspruch aufgetreten, die Menschen retten zu können. Solche hat es vor Christo gegeben, B. 8; solche gibt es auch jetzt. Von diesen redet Jesus in sehr scharfen Ausdrücken. Er nennt sie Diebe und Mörder. Sie gehen nicht zur Tür hinein; sie sind nicht von Gott gesandt und beglaubigt. Sie rufen wohl, aber die Schafe, Gottes Auserwählte, erkennen ihre Stimme nicht und folgen und gehorchen ihnen nicht. Sie bringen den Menschen nichts von ewigen Werken, sondern stürzen sie ins Verderben.

Die Namen Diebe und Mörder verdienen sie mit Recht. So verschieden in Einzelheiten ihre Worte auch lauten mögen, ob sie die Menschen anleiten, vor toten Götzen niederzufallen, oder ihnen zurufen: Jeder kann sich durch seine eigene Tugend selig machen, im Grunde ist ihre Verkündigung nur die des natürlichen Menschen, die Predigt von der Werkgerechtigkeit. Wehe den armen Seelen, die sich von diesen angeblichen Heilanden verführen lassen! Denn durch des Gesetzes Werke wird kein Fleisch vor Gott gerecht, Röm. 3, 20. Sie mögen wohl hoffen, daß sie in den Himmel kommen werden; aber welch schreckliche Enttäuschung wartet ihrer vor dem Richterstuhl Gottes!

Nichts kann die sündige Menschheit retten als nur die Predigt von Christo. Wir haben diese Wahrheit und sind verpflichtet, sie zu predigen. Gott gebe uns Gnade, daß wir in diesem Stück unsere Pflicht immer besser erkennen und, von der Liebe Christi getrieben, auch erfüllen!

Paul F. Kühneke



Miscellanea

The Campanius Catechism

Through the generosity of Mrs. Lydia Leatherman, well-known and active churchwoman, member of Salem Church, Minneapolis, Minn., the Northwestern Lutheran Theological Seminary has become the custodian of one of the most important relics of the Lutheran Church in America, the Delaware Catechism of John Campanius. The gift has an especial timeliness in view of the widely observed commemoration last year of the three-hundredth anniversary of the coming of the Lutheran Swedes to Delaware. But it has a perpetual significance as a great trophy of the spirit of true Lutheranism. One may doubt that American Lutheranism has a holier relic than this little book. When we consider that this devoted pastor, who sojourned in this country, then a wilderness, for only five years and was burdened throughout with parish cares, found time to learn the Delaware language from the Indians, reduce it to writing, and translate the Catechism into it, we wonder and admire. How great must have been his love for his fellow-men and his love for the Gospel! It is, moreover, a great glory to our Church that this book is the first translation of a Christian work into a tongue of the American Indians.

The Rev. John Campanius came to Fort Christina, Delaware, February 15, 1643, a man fitly described by his bishop as "a man most highly to be praised on account of his unwearied zeal in always propagating the love of God." He built a church at Tinicum, nine miles from Philadelphia, and returned to Sweden in 1648. We are told that he preached on Sundays and festivals, on Wednesdays and Fridays, and on all weekdays held morning and evening services. His Catechism was published by King Charles XI of Sweden, whose coat of arms appears on the leather cover and who sent many copies to America. The seminary's copy of the Catechism is a beautifully printed volume, with an illuminated title-page, bound in leather, and is in an excellent state of preservation. Though several hundreds of copies were printed and sent to this country, so far as we have been able to find out, fewer than half a dozen are now known to exist. There is an introduction of fourteen pages. The translation is followed paragraph by paragraph with a Swedish version. At the close there is a vocabulary of the Delaware language.

Thomas Campanius Holm, grandson of Campanius, writes: "The Indians were frequent visitors at my grandfather's house. When for the first time he performed divine service in the Swedish congregation, they came to hear him and greatly wondered that he had so much to say and that he stood alone and talked so long, while all the rest were listening in silence. This excited in them strange suspicions; they thought everything was not right and that some conspiracy was going forward among us, in consequence of which my grandfather's life and that of the other priests were, for some time, in considerable danger from the Indians, who daily came to him and asked him many questions."

Holm goes on to tell how the missionary won the natives' affection

and such acceptance for his message that they "induced him to exert himself to learn their language," with the result that "those people who were wandering in darkness were converted to the Christian faith or at least acquired so much knowledge of it that they were ready to exclaim, as Captain John Smith relates of the Virginia Indians, that, so far as the cannons and guns of the Christians exceeded the bows and arrows of the Indians in shooting, so far was their God superior to that of the Indians."

It is not without awe that one takes up this little book harking from the remote beginnings of our Church in the New World and reflects on the power that produced it and the fruits, which its author could never surmise. — *The Lutheran*, Feb. 15, 1939.

Zur Frage von der Teilnahme am Gemeindegottesdienst

„Darf ich ein paar Gedanken, die mich beim Lesen des Artikels im Dezemberblatt der *Pastoralblätter* bewegen, in das Gespräch werfen? Der Berner Professor D. Hadorn sagte mir einmal in seiner nüchternen Art: ‚Wir haben unsern Gemeinden so lange gesagt, daß der Kirchgang es nicht mache, daß sie nun eben nicht mehr kommen.‘ Daß die Auflösung dieses wichtigsten Punktes kirchlicher Sitte tief zu beklagen und verhängnisvoll ist, bedarf keines Wortes, auch nicht, daß Christen nur innerhalb [?] der Gemeinde möglich sind. Aber sehr vieler Worte bedürfte es, auf die Frage einzugehen, ob die Gemeinde nur da zu finden ist, wo der ‚rite vocatus‘ amtiert, wobei wiederum dieses ‚rite‘ einer ernststen Untersuchung zu unterziehen wäre. Aber das kann nicht in einem schlichten Wort zur Debatte geschehen. Da sind nur einige Fragen aus der Praxis am Platze.

„1. Nehmen wir an, daß es etwa 20,000 evangelische Pfarrer im Deutschen Reich gibt. Werden das je 20,000 hochbegabte Redner sein? Ist selbst der Begabteste immer auf der gleichen Höhe? Und ist der, selbst in seinen besten Stunden, für alle Hörer der rechte Mann?

„2. Es melde sich, wer gern eine langweilige Predigt hört und dadurch erquickt wird für die Woche! Und auch der melde sich, der das von einer hingensuckelten oder unecht deklamierten Liturgie, von schleppendem, vielleicht durch brüllendes Orgelspiel erdrücktem Gesang einer dünnen Gemeinde sagen kann oder von dem Kunstgesang eines Chors, der vor der Verkündigung die Kirche fluchtartig verläßt!

„3. Kann jemand, der innerlich zu einer bestimmten kirchlichen Gruppe gehört, in der Predigt eines scheltenden Pfarrers der andern Richtung Erbauung finden? Kann ein Mensch, der durch pietistische Art geprägt ist, sich da Kraft holen, wo der Prediger auf diese Art offen schilt oder versteckt stichelt?

„4. Kann der abgekämpfte Mensch innerste Ermutung oder Stärkung da finden, wo er in der Hauptsache Theologie oder gar Kirchenpolitik vorgesetzt bekommt? Kann der innerlich einsame, nach wahrer Gemeinschaft schmachtende Mensch finden, was seine Seele sucht, wo meinetwegen ausgezeichnet gepredigt, recht gesungen und gar nicht gescholten oder gestichelt wird, wo all diese Fehler ganz vermieden werden, aber jeder am andern kalt vorübergeht und man nach jahrelangem, treuem Kirchgang genau so einsam ist wie am Anfang? (Diese Fragen sind Echo meiner Sprechstunden.)

„5. Muß also nicht unsere Gemeindeversammlung anders werden, wenn die Hungerigen wieder durch sie angezogen werden sollen? Wir Pfarrer sind auf der Universität zu mehr oder weniger gelehrten Botanikern ausgebildet und sollen dann Gärtner sein! Wir haben allerlei Zoologie im Kopf, sollen aber Hirten sein! Ein botanischer Vortrag an jedem Sonntagmorgen geht über die Kraft des arbeitenden Menschen; ob er aber nicht gern in einen edlen Garten ginge? Der Zoolog hat keine Anziehungskraft für die hungrige und durstige Herde, aber wohl die grüne Au und das frische Wasser.

„6. Hat nicht Schlatter recht, wenn er einmal sagt, das Zeitalter des Meritismus sei vorbei und das der Gemeinde komme?

„Pastoralblätter, Jahrg. 81, Heft 5 (Febr. 1939)

„D. Paul Seur, Potsdam“

Das Obige erinnert an Schwächen und Verkehrtheiten, die dem Staatskirchenrecht anhaften. Daß es aber auch uns etwas zu sagen hat, wird niemand leugnen können.

A.

Die Vernunft hat nicht in die Theologie dreinzureden

Wir lesen in der „Theologischen Quartalschrift“, Oktober 1938, S. 266 f.: „Gott ist unabhängig von Zeit und Raum und Kausalität; aber gewiß gelten doch auch für ihn die Gesetze der Logik? Nein, auch diese sind unbegriffen in das Wort ‚schuf‘ (Am Anfang schuf Gott Himmel und Erde‘). Uns erscheint nichts einfacher und klarer als der Satz, daß zweimal zwei vier ist. Alle Berechnungen des Geschäfts und der Wissenschaft bauen sich auf ihn auf. Welch eine Verwirrung würde entstehen, wenn er plötzlich nicht mehr gelten sollte! Aller Verkehr unter den Menschen würde unmöglich werden. So einleuchtend ist dieser einfache Satz, daß jemand, der seine Gültigkeit im Ernst anzweifelte, sofort als geistig gestört erkannt würde. So offensichtlich scheint diese Wahrheit in der Natur der Dinge begründet zu sein, daß es für einen normalen Menschen einfach unmöglich ist, sich ein anderes Verhältnis zu denken. Selbst die Relativitätstheorie läßt doch diesen Satz unangetastet stehen.

„Dennoch gilt dieser Satz nicht weiter, als die gegenwärtige Welt reicht. Er ist mit eingeschlossen in den Begriff Himmel und Erde, ein Erzeugnis der Schöpfer Tätigkeit Gottes. Gott hat dies Zahlenverhältnis für Himmel und Erde festgelegt. Er ist ihm nicht unterworfen. Er läßt uns einen kleinen Blick in seine Unabhängigkeit von jedem Zahlenverhältnis tun, indem er sich als den Dreieinigen offenbart. Der Vater ist Gott, der Sohn ist Gott, der Heilige Geist ist Gott; und sind doch nicht drei Götter, sondern es ist ein Gott.“

„Dasselbe gilt von allen Regeln der Logik: dem Satz von der Identität, vom Widerspruch, vom ausgeschlossenen Dritten. Gott hat diese Denfgesetze zugleich mit Himmel und Erde und für Himmel und Erde erschaffen. Er will auch, daß wir all unser Leben nach ihnen einrichten. Er spricht das Wehe über solche aus, die aus weiß schwarz und aus schwarz weiß machen, die aus sauer süß und aus süß sauer machen. Aber er selbst ist diesen Gesetzen nicht unterworfen. Dafür gibt er uns ein Beispiel, wenn er uns auf eine für uns alle überaus wichtige Frage eine unserer Vernunft so ärgerliche Antwort gibt. Wir fragen: Warum werden etliche Menschen selig? und Gott antwortet: Das ist allein meine Gnade. Warum gehen andere Men-

schen verloren? Das ist durchaus ihre eigene Schuld. Fragen wir weiter, wie denn das stimme: gleiche Schuld, gleiche Gnade und doch so verschiedene Resultate, so betweigert uns Gott nicht nur die Antwort, sondern verweist uns auch die Frage als eine notwendige und fordert uns auf, ihm zuzutreten, daß alles in Ordnung sei, und uns seiner Gnade zu freuen. . . ." E.

Who Attended to Stephen's Burial?

The question hinges on the use of *ἄνδρες εὐλαβεῖς*, the "devout men" of Acts 8:2 who carried Stephen to his grave. It was they who gathered up his mangled remains, *συνεκόμισαν* from *συγκομίζω*. There is no difficulty in *συγκομίζω*. We are prepared for this sad use of the verb by the LXX in Job 5:26, "Thou shalt come to thy grave in a full age, like as a shock of corn cometh in (*συνκομισθεῖσα*) in his season."

But who were they that buried Stephen? The disciples were all dispersed by the Pauline persecution. In the entire New Testament Luke alone uses the descriptive *εὐλαβεῖς* and always of certain pious Jews. It is a designation distinctly different from the ones used to describe the avowed followers of the Savior. Only three other times Luke employs *εὐλαβεῖς*, once of Simeon, 2:25, then of the "Jews, devout men from every nation," Acts 2:5, and lastly of "Ananias, devout according to the Law," Acts 22:12.

The Vulgate calls these devout men the *virī timorati*, and originally in its classic use *εὐλαβεῖς* denoted men of a prudent, thoughtful, circumspect, and cautious nature. It was the most appropriate word that the Greco-Roman era had to describe the best of the Jewish worshippers. Most modern versions translate with Luther "God-fearing men."

The result of Stephen's inspired and fearless testimony was nothing less than a common lynching. First the hypocrisy of pious form was observed by taking the first martyr without the confines of the "holy" city. Then, unhampered by pious (*εὐλαβεῖς*) considerations, these mob-ridden Sanhedrinists rushed upon Stephen and pelted him to death. There was not even a vote of condemnation. There was no consultation of the powers of the Law. The dignity of the Sanhedrin had gone the way of its vanished authority. In the face of the howling mob Stephen's companions and fellow-believers had considered their hasty removal from the death scene the better part of valor.

In the crowd there were others, however. They were *ἄνδρες εὐλαβεῖς*, devout men. According to St. Luke's language they were devout Jews. It must have pained and deeply grieved the truly devout Jew to see his respected Sanhedrin howl with a murderous mob. There are also always men, even though on the opposing side, who admire the courage and sincerity of conviction of him whose belief they cannot follow.

Yes, after the tumult and the shouting had died and while the blood of Stephen was already reaching out to halt the pharisaic progress of the approving young Rabbi from Tarsus, there were some cautious, thoughtful, God-fearing, and devout men among the Jews, *ἄνδρες εὐλαβεῖς*, maybe only two, who like Nicodemus and the well-to-do Joseph carefully came and devoutly gave the young confessor a decent burial.

Los Angeles, Calif.

R. T. DU BRAU

Theological Observer — ദിനപത്രം

A U. L. C. Layman Speaks.—In the *Lutheran* of January 18, 1939, the following letter is printed: "There has come to my desk a 'Declaration' adopted by the United Lutheran Church at its recent convention in Baltimore. I do not feel myself competent to criticize. I am not a theologian as were those who formulated the 'Declaration'; yet one or two things therein cause me to wonder and to inquire.

"In Section 1 it is declared: 'We believe the only rule and standard according to which all dogmas and teachers are to be esteemed and judged are nothing else than the prophetic and apostolic Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments.' My question in that connection is: Why qualify the Scriptures with *prophetic* and *apostolic*? In other words, are we to gather from this statement that there are Scriptures which are neither prophetic nor apostolic; that there are portions thereof which may not be used as a standard by which to judge?

"In Section 5 this declaration: 'We therefore accept the Scriptures as the infallible truth of God in all matters that pertain to His revelation and our salvation.' What as to matters that do not pertain to His revelation and our salvation? Are some portions of the Scriptures not infallible? Is not that a plausible inference?

"It would appear to this writer that in Section 6 this position is contradicted when it is asserted: 'Therefore we believe that the whole body of Scripture in all its parts is the Word of God.' E. A. S."

The President of Augustana College (Augustana Synod Institution) Criticizes Missouri.—In reply to a letter Dr. Bergendoff, president of Augustana College, in Rock Island, Ill., wrote as follows (his answer was published in the *Bulletin* of his school and the part here given was reprinted in the *Lutheran* (U. L. C.): "You inquire whether the Augustana Synod could subscribe to doctrinal statements already drawn up by the Missouri Synod. I do not know if I can make myself clear in my reply without avoiding the issue, which is exactly what I do not intend. But (and I emphasize that I speak only as an individual, I have no right to speak for the synod) I must say that I question the method of attaining fellowship which consists in one party offering a document to the other to be signed on the dotted line. Indeed, it is just this method which will preclude our coming closer. It is my contention that we are to meet each other as Lutherans and not as suppliants asking for the right to be called Lutherans by others who have decided what Lutheranism is. The question is ultimately not an intellectual question and cannot be solved merely by formulae. For I believe I speak truly when I say that many Lutherans in America do not accept the Missouri Synod as the judge of their faith or of their Lutheranism. You treat us as non-Lutherans. We resent it. At once a gulf is created which now seems unbridgeable.

"I say this in no spirit of criticism. I say it rather from a wounded and anxious heart—wounded because brethren in the faith refuse to acknowledge their brethren, anxious lest any word I write widen

rather than help bridge the cleft that divides us. But I can see no other result than this, that, when Missouri has already judged all others as non-Lutherans, then she can only be left alone. And this is tragic, because we need each other.

"Insistent as the synod has always been on the faithfulness of the Church to her confessions, Augustana has wanted fellowship with other Lutherans in this country who also accept those confessions as basic to their ministry. We were members of the General Council for almost fifty years. When the United Lutheran Church was formed, we were invited to join the new body but decided to remain independent. The causes were practical and social, not doctrinal. We have for decades cooperated with the Lutherans of the General Council and, later, the U.L.C.A. in foreign missionary work. Our relationships in deaconess and educational work have been very close and cordial. Some of us have had as teachers the staunch conservatives of Mount Airy, such as Krauth, Schmauck, and Jacobs. Our life has been enriched and strengthened by these contacts. Since the dissolution of the General Council we have had organic relationship with the U.L.C.A. only indirectly, such as through the National Lutheran Council, but there is a growing friendship between many men and activities of that part of Lutheranism with our own.

"We have sprung from the Church of Sweden and for the greater part of our history have depended upon it for much of our life. Our worship, our doctrinal and devotional literature, our educational standards, our conception of the nature of the work of the Church, have been derived from this Church, whose history since the Reformation has been an inspiration for us even in this country. Edmund Burke once said that you cannot indict a nation. I would add, nor a nation's Church. Therefore, when the Church of Sweden is attacked and criticized, I always feel that the accuser is using rather big words. The Church of Sweden contains many tendencies and elements, and I know from a year's study in Sweden that some of the things which are said by Missouri Synod spokesmen regarding the Church of Sweden are neither true nor charitable. This disturbs me the more because we do not intend to cut ourselves off from a rich tradition and a living force which can stimulate our own thinking and deepen our own faith. The men with whom we enjoy relationships are among the leading Lutheran scholars and pastors of the present generation, and the Church of Sweden is one of the most potent parts of world Lutheranism. You mention your interest in our liturgy. The liturgy is but one of the many treasures we have received from the Church in Sweden. What Germany has meant to the Missouri Synod, Sweden has meant to the Augustana Synod, and in this sense Sweden and Lutheranism are more of a unit than Germany and Lutheranism. When, therefore, you hear it claimed that Augustana is too friendly with the Church of Sweden for fellowship with the Missouri Synod, I would ask you to remember that some one is not clear in his thinking and is asking us to commit a violation of the commandment which bids us honor father and mother if he asks us to forsake connections with that Church. There are men in Sweden with whom we have no theological sympathy; but there

are many more men in high and low positions whom we consider among the finest exponents of Lutheranism in the world today.

"I have written at considerable length, and yet I feel that I have only touched a few of the vital subjects that concern us both. Is this not in itself a token of what we are losing because we keep so aloof from each other? We are digging down our treasures and not allowing them to grow by circulation. I long for the day when we can meet, not in forums as opponents in debating societies, but as brethren who can rejoice in each other's fellowship because their fellowship is one of common faith and mutual love."

What are we to say? It grieves us to think that anybody should feel it necessary to write about us as the president of Augustana College did. His remarks were composed, we doubt not, with the evident desire of furthering the cause of the truth and should lead every Missourian to engage in a searching self-examination to see whether or not he or his church-body is guilty of the uncharitable conduct complained of. We are convinced that Missourians with practical unanimity will reply that their attitude is misunderstood. Their endeavor to express the truth which they believe in their hearts and in the possession of which they rejoice, with as much clarity as possible and their submitting such expression of their faith to others with the remark, This is where we stand; will you share our position? is regarded as "a method of attaining fellowship which consists in one party offering a document to the other to be signed on the dotted line." Their position, a self-evident one and acknowledged as correct in all other realms, that nomenclature, if it is to be recognized, must be based on facts, and that the mere name "Lutheran" does not suffice to make one a Lutheran is considered an attitude expecting others to come "as suppliants asking for the right to be called Lutherans." Their protest against uninterrupted fellowship between the State Church of Sweden and the Augustana Synod while the former tolerates much modernistic teaching in its midst, is looked upon as a call urging Augustana to transgress the commandment inculcating honoring one's parents and not rather as an admonition to heed the word of Jesus "If any man come to Me and hate not his father and mother and wife and children and brethren and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be My disciple," Luke 14: 26. If Dr. Bergendoff wishes to receive from us the confession that we Missourians are poor, fallible human beings, compelled to walk the way to heaven in constant watchfulness, lest thinking they stand they might fall, we shall give it to him at once. But we hope he believes us when we say that it is just this anxiety about our soul's salvation which impels us to practise loyalty to the Scriptures and to follow the course outlined in the Word of God for the disciples of Jesus Christ, even if such a course should mean isolation and conflict.

A.

A Wrong Way of Promoting Lutheran Unity.—In the *Lutheran Church Quarterly* of January, 1939, Rev. William P. Christy publishes an article having the heading "The Middle West and Lutheran Unity," from which the *Lutheran* quotes the following paragraphs:

"All self-respecting Lutherans should desire most sincerely to contribute the best that they have to a nation-wide Church; but at the

same time they should encourage one another to believe that what is best in any part cannot be lost in a merger that is prompted and guided by the Holy Ghost and that that which is inferior in any part cannot survive such a merger.

"There is a spirit of legalism that pervades many of the ranks of Mid-Western Lutherans, a kind of approach to the truth of God which insists on 'book, chapter, and verse' for all the 'eye-blinks' of life and must be undergirded by the authority of print on paper for every conscious breath in order to be assured of full salvation. In its last analysis this resolves itself into a conception of the Holy Scriptures as a mechanical work of the Holy Spirit, inerrant in every word and detail in their original form and held by some to be literally so even in the form which we now possess. This legalistic spirit may account for the rigid conditions that are laid down as prerequisites to full fellowship. Yet the evangelical spirit which characterized the early Church did not exclude those who combined remnants of the Law with interpretations of the Gospel. It was the Judaizing tendencies which caused divisions among the brethren. Yet the early Church was big enough to include them all. A shift of emphasis is needed by many today to a more evangelical approach to the truth of God, one that centers unconditionally on the Son of God and man's Savior, Jesus Christ, by faith in whom all values are established and all problems solved. A more complete turn in that direction would hasten the day of better understanding."

If Pastor Christy is truly concerned about Lutheran unity, he certainly follows the wrong method of bringing it about. Everybody will see at once that the attitude toward the Scriptures which he opposes is not fairly described by him but that what he depicts is a caricature. How often must confessional Lutherans repeat that their teaching of the doctrine of verbal inspiration does not imply a "mechanical" process! Furthermore, that insistence on loyalty to everything that the Scriptures say does not mean that a person is taking a legalistic attitude, is sufficiently evident from the course of our Savior Himself, who, in taking His stand on the Scriptures and saying, "It is written," furnished us the great example which we endeavor to follow. A.

The Need of a Teaching Ministry.— Under this heading, Theodore R. Ludlow, in the *Anglican Theological Review* (Vol. XX, No. 4), appeals for better instruction of the adult church-membership for spiritual growth, a subject which certainly must interest also our own ministers, especially in view of the fact that at present many adult members come to us from other religious circles or from such as are entirely non-religious. We quote a number of statements which, we think, contain much food for thought. The author says among other things: "Little or no systematic effort is made to guide and continue the integration of the individual's personality in the face of the constantly new problems which he has to meet in political, social, moral, and religious spheres. In the latent spiritual capacity of our adult members lies the greatest undeveloped resource of our Church. The ability of these members to solve their own problems as well as the problems of their fellow-men lies in their own hands in proportion to their understanding of

their function as necessary coworkers with God and their willingness to increase their spiritual capacity, so that they may become still more effective workers. The tragedy of the situation is that too few of our priests know how to teach their normal adult people the process of continuous spiritual growth. Too many of them presuppose an understanding of the spiritual self on the part of the laity. As a matter of fact our people do not understand their own spiritual capacity or how to develop it, and until the conflicts arising out of those facts are resolved in their own lives, they are incapable of adequately facing other human problems even when they have the will to do so. . . . The implication is that, if you know how to teach a child, you know how to teach an adult. The facts of the case are quite different. Adults have their own characteristics, interests, and motivations, which are radically different from those of childhood. . . . Christ did most of His work with normal adults and was able to increase the educability of grown people. Under His skilful teaching they had new spiritual experiences, received new insights into reality, and gave themselves to new loyalties. Having held them to an ideal, He put them to work to realize that ideal in their own lives by sending them out to teach still other people the character and purpose of God. . . . Ours is the privilege and the task of awakening our people to their own potentiality and of providing the nurturing means by which their latent powers may grow and express themselves by service. Ours is the responsibility for seeing to it that men are trained, so that as followers of the Master they may 'go about all the cities and villages, teaching in their synagogues.'—The few sentences which we could quote here nevertheless bring before us a problem which today is of prime importance. How to solve the problem must be every active pastor's concern. Here the sermon—the minister's rifle and bayonet, as some one has expressed it—must be relied upon to do its proper share; but the sermon alone will not suffice. There must be additional educational factors. In the past we have rightly given much emphasis to our Christian day-schools as means of indoctrinating our youthful members. Today indoctrination must be enlarged and carried on through the high-school and college ages. But even there it dare not stop; for then come the men and women in their prime of life who, too, must be vitalized for Christian growth in service. After that we must win for continued and yet greater service those faithful "older few" who have proved the backbone of our churches and their constant, willing burden-bearers. Certainly the problem is of immense importance and should be discussed by us in all circles where we have opportunity to urge it. Our greatest foe, after all, is spiritual decay in knowledge and service.

J. T. M.

Hall Caine and Emil Brunner Destructive Critics.—In *Christianity Today* (Vol. 9, No. 2) the Rev. Dr. Oswald T. Allis (scholarly orthodox Calvinist, affiliated with Machen's Westminster group after long and excellent service at Princeton Seminary) subjects Hall Caine's posthumous *Life of Christ* (Doubleday, Doran & Co., 1938) to a searching criticism. Caine's *Life of Christ* itself is a work of 1,300 pages, so that Allis's "appraisal" must needs become a rather lengthy article. Briefly expressed, what the "appraisal" shows is that Caine's belief concerning

Christ is closely Fosdickian; for, while he denies every distinctively Christian doctrine (belief in an inspired and infallible Word of God is "blasphemous"; the miracles "supposedly" performed by Christ are "unauthentic and impossible"; the stories of Christ's virgin birth and resurrection are like the "mirage in the desert, which dissolves at the next movement of the setting sun"; etc.), he nevertheless poses as a Christian, rejuvenating the ancient faith, yet leaving it intact. Dr. Allis says of him: "Caine subjects all of this glorious Gospel of the grace of God to a merciless, a truly devastating criticism, which leaves it in ruins and, if carried to a logical extreme, would end in utter skepticism. Yet he seems to believe that he can retain everything that is really vital to Christian faith; if not as fact, at least as an ideal which is truer than the truth." (P. 85.) But it is not on this account that we refer to Professor Allis's excellent article. At its close Dr. Allis compares Hall Caine's destructive criticism to that of the Theology of Crisis (Barth, Brunner, Otto, etc.) with its new category of the "superhistorical," of which he says: "If we have any understanding of the nature of this category, it is one to which such 'recorded facts' of Scripture as are considered valuable doctrinally, though indefensible historically, can be referred, instead of discarding them as worthless, denouncing them as false or relegating them to the realm of myth, legend, or allegory. For those who are prepared to accept the negative conclusions of naturalistic criticism and at the same time desire to retain a substantial content of the Christian faith, this category of the 'superhistorical' would seem to be almost ideal." To show how well Higher Critic Caine and Higher Critic Brunner seem to agree, he next quotes from the latter's book *The Mediator* (English translation, 1934), in particular from the chapter "The Christian Faith and Historical Research," in which Brunner declares: "Thus, even if we limit the formulation of our problem to the fact of the life of Jesus, here also, however, the general statement must be repeated: *Faith must neither be able to hold firm to everything, nor could it surrender everything without coming to an end of itself. That is, faith may indeed be combined with criticism of the Biblical tradition about the life of Jesus, perhaps even with a very radical form of criticism.* But it is not possible to combine faith with every kind of criticism; for instance, it cannot be combined with the kind of criticism which denies the existence of Jesus altogether or with that which represents Him as a psychopathic individual or as a proletarian revolutionary. Indeed, in principle the question can only be answered thus: Faith can be combined with all kinds of historical criticism which do not alter the historical image of the existence of Jesus to such an extent that—so far as faith is concerned—it would be impossible to understand the apostolic testimony to Christ." (P. 168.) Dr. Allis then asks: "How shall we estimate Caine's book in the light of this statement? Are we to infer that, according to the Crisis Theology as understood by Professor Brunner, Christian faith is to be regarded as compatible with such radical criticism as Hall Caine indulges in?" "Brunner and Caine," he goes on to say, "are both polemic against the doctrine of the plenary inspiration of Scripture. Brunner seems to regard such a doctrine as inimical to faith. And both regard the doctrine of the Virgin

Birth as a liability, a stumbling-block to faith today." He next requests Brunner to review Caine's book and to state in simple, non-technical language at what point he would part company with Hall Caine. In conclusion Dr. Allis declares: "Whatever may be the answer of the Crisis Theology to these questions, the answer of orthodoxy—that orthodoxy which both Caine and Brunner reject because it rests four-square on the plenary inspiration and divine authority of Holy Scriptures—is definite and clear. The Christ of the Scriptures is the Christ of the Christian faith. The incarnate Word is revealed in the written Word. The only real Christ is the Christ of the Bible. Skeptical criticism is therefore the arch-enemy of the Christian faith. An amicable understanding between them is impossible. A Christian faith which is willing to accept the conclusions of radical criticism has handed over the key of its castle to the enemy who aims at its destruction." All believing Christians, we think, should be grateful to Dr. Allis for his excellent "appraisal" of the radicalism of both Hall Caine and Emil Brunner. What both teach is Modernism, though they differ in degree.

J. T. M.

Southern Presbyteries Protest Against Dr. Brunner.—The *Christian Beacon*, official organ of the Faith Presbyterians (a group which separated from the Machen denomination [Westminster Seminary] on account of premillennialism and prohibition favored by them), in its issue of January 19, 1939, reports that two Southern presbyteries strongly objected to the lectures which Dr. Emil Brunner (liberal Barthian, now teaching at Princeton Seminary upon President Mackay's invitation) held at Union Theological Seminary (Presbyterian seminary, Richmond, Va., formerly Calvinistically orthodox, but infected with Liberalism like Princeton). Union Theological Seminary is sponsored by the Presbyterian Synod of North Carolina and the Synod of Virginia. To the Presbyterian Synod of North Carolina belong both protesting presbyteries, the Mecklenburg Presbytery (Greensboro, N. C.) and the Concord Presbytery. The protesting letter sent to Dr. B. R. Lacy of Union Theological Seminary by the Mecklenburg Presbytery (quoted in part) reads as follows: "Recently Dr. Emil Brunner of Zurich, Switzerland, addressed a group of ministers in Charlotte. In this address Dr. Brunner, among many other statements, while exalting Jesus Christ as the divine Son of God and the only Savior of the world, used the following language: 1. I do not believe in the verbal inspiration of the Scriptures; 2. I do not believe a thing just because I see it in the Bible; 3. The Bible is by no means free of errors, notably the story of creation, which science has proved to be erroneous. In view of many statements similar to the above and of other evidence which reveal the fact that this brother [?] is entirely out of sympathy with the historic position of our Church on inspiration and kindred subjects, we have heard with sorrow that Dr. Brunner is to visit Union Seminary at Richmond as the guest speaker of the seminary. We express to you as president our distress at bringing an outstanding man of this type into our seminary."

By the way, Dr. Brunner was to deliver only the auxiliary lectures, while Dr. John R. Mott (a mediating Modernist) was to deliver the main series. It may interest our readers to know that it was from liberal

Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, that last summer the Rev. Dr. J. Scherer, liberal U. L. C. A. pastor in that city, drew his supply pastor while on a lengthy vacation. Dr. Brunner's views on the Bible, set forth above, are very similar to those expressed for several years in official periodicals of the United Lutheran Church. They, too, deny the verbal inspiration of Scripture and hold that it contains errors. Are Barthian influences governing large areas and leading groups in the U. L. C. A.? But after all is said, Barthianism, especially in its Brunnerian type, is only a new form of modernistic rationalism, which in recent times has been rejected again and again by orthodox Calvinistic divines. It repudiates both the *sola Scriptura* and the *sola gratia* in the sense of the Reformation.

J. T. M.

Pius XI Deceased.—When on February 10 Pope Pius XI died, eighty-one years old, the daily press was fulsome in its praise of the Pontiff as a great and good man. All will agree that in comparison with John XXIII, Alexander VI, and Julius II the late Pope stands before us as a model of sanctity. We are not surprised to see him differ markedly from the predecessors mentioned because it must be said that since the days of the Protestant Reformation the times are past when a Pope, pretending to be the head of Christendom, can conduct himself as an exponent of Epicureanism, if not in theory, then at any rate in practise. But has the Papacy changed so that we no longer have to declare its incumbent to possess all the features of the Antichrist as described in 2 Thess. 2? Let no one entertain such a delusion. The chief characteristics which have made the Roman See what it is, the anathematization of the doctrine of justification by grace, for Christ's sake, through faith, and the arrogant assumption of power belonging to Christ alone, continue. Pope Pius XI did not renounce one iota of these deadly errors. While he interested himself much in social questions and made utterances which were widely hailed as establishing principles of justice and fairness in the relations of employers and employees, he did not recede one inch from those false teachings which our Confessions ascribe to the Papacy and condemn and which subvert the very foundation of Christianity. It is reported that upon being informed of his election he said, "I protest before the members of the Sacred College that I have at heart the safeguarding and defense of the rights of the Church and of the prerogatives of the Holy See." This promise, it must be admitted, he faithfully kept. That through him thirty-one "saints" were added to the list of people that have received canonization and 531 others were included among those declared "beatified" furnished an indication that he did not intend to leave the paths of the old doctrine.

America, the weekly of the Jesuits, says in an article by Edmund A. Walsh: "Pius XI, obviously, will take his place in history as the Pope of the Conciliation. He will likewise be distinguished as the Pope of Catholic Action and of great encyclicals such as *Quadragesimo Anno*, but in the opinion of the present writer his early recognition of the danger to the world inherent in Communism and Bolshevism will merit a high place among the greatest of Popes. As early as 1922 His Holiness took a definite stand by presenting to the powers assembled

at the Genoa Conference a memorandum on the menace to human liberty in Soviet Russia, together with a petition for guarantees from the Russian Government. Had the statesmen of Europe then heeded the warning and shown the same prudent foresight manifested by Pius XI, they would not today be faced by the ominous specter of Communism endangering the peace of the world."

In our opinion the *régime* of this Pope will be chiefly remembered for the restoration of temporal power to the Papacy, giving it a visible kingdom, which, though insignificant in size, nevertheless satisfies the Archimedean condition "Furnish me but a spot to stand on!" The bringing about of concordats with various states, the centralization of control in Rome over all the Roman Catholic theological seminaries throughout the world, the increase in the number of bishops, were means by which he furthered his plans. Shrewd, versatile, industrious, able to use reverses for the arousing of sympathy for himself and his Church, he advanced the interests of the gigantic machine of which he was the head.

A.

Does This Make It Unanimous? — This is taken from an advertisement in *America* of December 10, 1933, signed by Father Bernard A. Cullen, Director-General of the Marquette League for Catholic Indian Missions, New York. The petition of the Rev. Abel Caillouet, heartily endorsed by the Most Reverend Joseph F. Rummel, Archbishop of New Orleans, for aid in erecting a combination chapel and school for his Terrebbonne Indians is quoted:

"What good could we not accomplish among our Indians if we could only start a Catholic school and build a chapel for them! The non-Catholic sects have understood the importance of such work, and they have already entered into the fold of our Catholic Indians. . . . Under our very eyes we see our Catholic Indians drift away from the Church. Yet, how forbid them entirely from frequenting the Protestant school when it is a choice between that and continued illiteracy? Some parents say that their children attend the non-Catholic school merely to learn how to read and write and not to change their religion. How hard it is, however, to draw the line between instruction and influence! Other parents, with a faith well worthy of heroes, flatly refuse to send their children to the non-Catholic school and prefer to keep them home in their illiteracy rather than expose them to the danger of losing their faith. How can the Church fail them in their loyalty? The wolf is already in the fold; how can the shepherd stand by idly? Something *must* be done, and quickly, if the faith is to be preserved among these outcasts of all but Christ. . . . In spite of many drawbacks they have kept the faith for over a century through the zeal and efforts of tireless missionaries and by the grace of God. Many are about to lose it now; alas! some have already lost it. To remain indifferent to their plight would betray a lack of faith on our part."

A century of loyal membership in the Roman Catholic Church, a century of service by zealous and tireless Roman Catholic missionaries, — and still they are illiterate! And not because they want to remain so, not because they refuse an education; no, they desire it,

they plead for it; in a hundred years they do not get it. But now the wolf of Protestantism enters the field and offers to supply the want; and suddenly "the Church" recognizes the need of education! Are we right when we say: The Roman Catholic hierarchy prefers to keep the membership of the Church ignorant? Only to meet competition do they favor and promote public education.

T. H.

A Catholic Bishop in Denmark. — *America* reports: "For the first time since the Protestant Reformation Denmark will see a native Danish bishop exercising jurisdiction in his own land. The Most Rev. Theodore Suhr, O. S. B., Titular Bishop of Balecio and Vicar Apostolic of Denmark, was consecrated in Rome on January 16. He was born a Lutheran in 1896 and became a Catholic in 1926. On February 3, the Feast of St. Ansgar, Apostle of Scandinavia, he will take charge of his see."

T. H.

The "Living Church" reports: "Membership of churches in the United States is 64,156,895, according to figures released by the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. The great majority of the members, or 52,379,579, are more than thirteen years old. The total number of churches in the country is given as 248,410 and the number of different religious bodies as 200. Totals were assembled by the Rev. Dr. Herman C. Weber, editor of the *Year-book of American Churches*. Dr. Weber's figures show, according to the *New York Times*, that membership of churches in the United States has increased twice as fast as the population in 1937. Increase in churches was 1,743. 'Significant of the trend toward church unity,' the Federal Council's report points out, 'is the fact that 97.3 per cent. of the total membership is in the 50 largest bodies—all with a membership of 50,000 or over. The small bodies, approximately 160, account for only 2.7 per cent. of this great church population. Moreover, the former total of 212 bodies has been reduced by "mergers and disappearances" to 200. The membership thirteen years of age and over increased by 963,396 during the period covered.'"

F. E. M.

Brief Items. — The conditions of the Jews, spiritually, physically, morally, are deplorable and staggering. As typical of the Jews in the United States in general, the Jews of New York present a striking illustration; for the latest official figures show that the total number of contributing members of all the synagogues in the five boroughs of Greater New York is less than fifty thousand! And this includes Reformed as well as Orthodox synagogues! Where are the rest of the two million? Drifting into agnosticism, anarchy, Socialism, atheism, infidelity. No people in America are so desperately in need of the Gospel today as the Jews. (Quoted in the *Presbyterian*.)

Denmark has its first woman preacher. Miss Ruth Vermehren recently completed her course of theological training and has been called to serve as assistant pastor among the prisoners at Christianshavn. It was only a few months ago, after long consideration, that Norway finally approved of women in the ministry. Reports indicate that Sweden is discussing the topic with considerable heat. — *N. C. L. Bulletin*.

In the *Episcopal Recorder*, a monthly published in the interest of

the Reformed Episcopal Church, the editor, expressing a warning against Modernists, says: "They call the substitutionary atonement a religion of the shambles, a slaughter-house religion. They say, It makes no difference whether Christ was born of a virgin or not. They scoff at the idea of the verbal inspiration of the Word of God. They talk of all religions as a way to God. And, mark it well, this is within the Church." More power to such witness-bearing!

Dr. Schweitzer, noted missionary, musician, and New Testament scholar, was expected to be in Europe during January. Some of his friends in London hoped he would spend his sixty-fourth birthday (January 14) in that city.

As far as we know, the seminary property at Shekow has not been damaged at all by the war. (In *Lutheran Companion*.)

A writer in the *Lutheran Companion*, referring to conditions in Sweden, says: "At present there is quite a High-church movement among some of the Swedish clergy and among students of theology. In some instances this borders very closely on High-church Anglicanism. It might be noted also in this connection that Anglican theology is highly spoken of in Sweden today, and it is a question whether it might not to some degree even here [i. e., in Sweden] replace that of Germany."

In the *Lutheran Companion* of February 9, 1939, an article appears written by Erich Floreen of St. Paul, Minn. The article is written against the new theology in Sweden, one of whose exponents is Bishop Gustav Aulén. The article is valuable; but what we find disconcerting in it is this sentence, "Dr. Aulén is within his rights in assailing the theory of the verbal inspiration of the Bible." It is with deep sorrow that we see this writer speak of the teaching of verbal inspiration as a theory which may be assailed with impunity.

More than two and a half million dollars have been raised of the ten-million-dollar Sesquicentennial Fund for Christian Education of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., according to an announcement by Dr. Lewis S. Mudge, acting general secretary of the Board of Christian Education. The campaign will extend through 1939 and 1940.

At the divinity school of the University of Chicago Dr. Shirley J. Case retired as dean last July. His place has been taken by Dr. Ernest John Colwell, chairman of the department of the New Testament. Dr. Charles W. Gilkey of the Rockefeller Memorial Chapel has been made associate dean of the divinity school.

The New York correspondent of the *Christian Century* writes in a report on a lecture at Union Seminary by Dr. Emil Brunner, formerly of Zurich, now temporarily of Princeton Theological Seminary: "A few Presbyterian Fundamentalists have not been very happy that the neo-orthodox continental theologians who have been added to the staff at Princeton have not turned out to be the bulwark they were expected to be of the Fundamentalist brand of orthodoxy." Among the views ascribed to him is the one combating the idea that "all of the Bible was a revelation on a level with that part of it which leads to Christ." But on account of his evident Barthianism "old-fashioned Liberals were not happy with this neoorthodoxy either."

In Hyderabad, belonging to the Dornakal diocese (Anglican) of Southern India, there are now 220,000 Christians in a population numbering 17,877,000. Its bishop is a native, who is the first one of his countrymen to be so honored. From all over the world moneys are sent by Anglicans and Episcopalians supporting this work.

Lord Hugh Cecil is reported to have said a very true thing concerning the function of the Church and the Christian ministry: "The Church is not a study circle nor a theological college; it is rather an evangelist or a prophet." How well this agrees with the teaching of the Lutheran dogmaticians that theology is a *habitus practicus theosdotos!*

Dr. Alvin Johnson, director of the New School for Social Research, writing in the *Survey Graphic* of the more than eight hundred anti-Jewish organizations reported for this country, lists as the most important: Silver Shirts, Defenders of the Christian Faith, Industrial Defense Association, American Nationalist Confederation, James True Associates, Knights of the White Camellia, German-American Bund, and Father Coughlin's "one-man show." Dr. Johnson credits these organizations with about half of the six million adherents claimed by them. He warns: "We are dunces if we refuse to face the menace of anti-Semitism; weaklings, if we fail to supply our resources in combating it." — *Christian Century*.

The Union of American Hebrew Congregations is said to have planned a laymen's tour which will take a committee of one hundred eminent Jewish leaders into the various parts of the United States and Canada. The intention is to make this a propaganda for religious liberty and for acquainting people with "the truth about the Jew." The work is to be done in April and May.

According to press reports Dr. Charles W. Welch, the moderator of the Presbyterian General Assembly, is very optimistic concerning the union of the Northern and Southern Presbyterians and the Episcopalians. He was so bold as to prophesy that these churches would become united within three years.

With respect to the Mission Conference in Madras held in December, 1938, we have not as yet seen comprehensive reports. One item which came to our notice says that fifty per cent. of the delegates came from the younger churches of Asia, Africa, South America, and the Pacific Islands.

How active Roman Catholic leaders are we can glean from a report in the *Christian Advocate*, which says that almost every one of the more than one hundred dioceses of Roman Catholicism in the United States has its own weekly religious journal. Cardinal Mundelein of Chicago thinks that his paper, *The New World*, may become a daily by the end of 1939. We are happy to note that the circulation of some of our own church-papers is not anemic but in a healthy condition.

One reads with sorrow that a meeting of Oregon ministers held in Portland went on record as urging the abolition of capital punishment, charging it to be "a work of barbarism, not a crime-deterrent, and sadistic in its influence."

A.

 Book Review — Literatur

Abraham to Allenby. By G. Frederick Owen. With illustrations. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. 351 pages, 6×9. Price, \$2.50.

This book came to the reviewer's desk after he had laboriously collected a bibliography on the history of the Holy Land through four millenniums, the result of his efforts being collated in a list of some forty titles. It stands to reason that many of the monographs of this list present detailed information on certain phases of the history of the Holy Land which are needed for the expert in the field. At the same time it became evident that this one book contains practically *all* the information that the average pastor or teacher will actually need in a lifetime of teaching. The author, writing on the basis of the information gained as a member of the Palestine Oriental Society and in the American Schools of Oriental Research and with a bibliography of more than a hundred titles to offer information on the subject, has succeeded in a most remarkable manner in condensing the historical data connected with Palestine from the days of the patriarchs to the present British protectorate. From the standpoint of the man in the field the book will certainly suffice for all teaching needs. Not only is the account, based on the Bible, sound and conservative, but the chapters on the rise of Mohammedanism, on the crusades, on the four centuries of Turkish occupation, and on the present status of the Holy Land are very satisfactory. The illustrations are, for the most part, new and unusual, and the reference notes, like the bibliography, are very comprehensive. Only a few small queries had to be placed in connection with the chronology of Jesus. All in all, a splendid book for the pastor's library.

P. E. KRETZMANN

Der Jakobusbrief. Von Paul Le Seur. Gustav Schömanns Verlagsbuchhandlung, Leipzig und Hamburg. 107 Seiten 5½×8¼. Preis, kartoniert: RM. 2.20; geb. 3.00.

Der Hebräerbrief. Von Johannes Schneider. Derselbe Verlag. 131 Seiten 5½×8¼. Preis, kartoniert: RM. 2.60; geb. 3.40.

Diese neuesten Bände in der Serie „Bibelhilfe für die Gemeinde“ sind wiederum von dem Standpunkt eines konservativen Konfessionalismus aus geschrieben. Le Seur, der schon die Gefangenschaftsbriefe behandelt hat, bietet hier eine Auslegung des Jakobusbriefes, die auf gründlicher Einsicht in die Probleme des Briefes beruht und diesen wirklich in gemeinverständlicher Weise auslegt. Wenn auch für den Durchschnittsleser berechnet, so sind doch die Ausführungen durchweg so gründlich, daß selbst der wissenschaftliche Theolog viel Gewinn von dem Studium dieses Buches haben wird, namentlich für Bibelklassen. Einzelne Schlüsse des Verfassers sind so klar und bestimmt, daß sie sich fast unwillkürlich dem Gedächtnis einprägen. So der Satz: „Jakobus steht im Kampfe wider die tote Rechtgläubigkeit, die Paulus ebenso klar abweist (3. B. Gal. 5, 6 und 1 Kor. 13). Keiner von beiden kennt einen Glauben ohne Werke oder Werke ohne Glauben.“ (S. 60.) — Der Kommentar über den schwierigen Hebräerbrief, von Johannes

Schneider besorgt, ist durchweg sehr ansprechend, wenn er auch mehr Ausführungen als Auslegung bringt. Besonders gefallen hat uns die Erklärung von Hebr. 11, wo der Verfasser richtig sagt: „Es hat sich dabei nicht in jedem Fall um Heilsglauben gehandelt, wohl aber um Offenbarungsglauben, das heißt, um einen Glauben, der zum Gegenstand Gott, sein Offenbarungswort und seine Offenbarungstat hatte.“ (S. 99.) Jeder Pastor, der sich die andern Bände der „Bibelhilfe“ angeschafft hat, wird diese beiden Bände auch besitzen wollen.

B. E. Kreckmann

Walther and the Church. By Wm. Dallmann, D. D., W. H. T. Dau, D. D., and Th. Engelder, D. D., Editor. Foreword by F. Pfotenhauer, D. D. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. 140 pages, 5¼×7½. Price, \$1.00.

Much has been written in praise of this fine centennial contribution, and indeed it deserves all that has been said in its favor. When Dr. Walther and his collaborators organized in our country (on the basis of the Bible) a Church governed by strictly democratic principles, they accomplished a feat which even Luther's Reformation could not achieve; for they went back to that church polity which the apostles in Christ's name established in their own time. The Baptists and Congregationalists come nearest the Lutherans in recognizing congregational independence. Our fathers did not exalt the local congregation above God's Word, though they restored to it the full freedom which it possesses according to Scripture. But Dr. Walther did more. He not only established a true church democracy but also adequately trained (through the ministers he educated) the several churches rightly to govern themselves in accordance with God's Word, and thus the seeming disorganization proved itself the most potent organization. Today the simple, elementary principles regarding the Church, its function, and management, stressed by Dr. Walther in the book before us, require new emphasis, for there is danger that we forget that, while the local church in its peculiar sphere is sovereign, it is altogether subject to God's Word and bound to its sister congregations by the commandment of Christian love. A "strong central government," "better organization," a "more efficient machinery," will not benefit us at all if we do not in true faith obey God's Word and in true love serve Him and the neighbor. The grave dangers of our age, threatening us from every side, invite careful study of this new book by both our clergy and laity. It is the product of four prominent theologians in our Synod. Each has written an essay of rare worth: Dr. Pfotenhauer, a most instructive Foreword; Dr. Dau, an excellent appraisal of Dr. Walther as a man of God and fighter of His battles; Dr. Engelder, an estimate of Dr. Walther as a true Bible theologian; and Dr. Dallmann, one showing Dr. Walther's high respect for the Christian congregation as such. All three essays are real gems of literary art. The book also contains synopses of three works of Walther: *The Voice of Our Church on the Question Concerning the Church and the Ministry*; *The Proper Form of an Ev. Luth. Congregation Independent of the State*; and *The Ev. Luth. Church the True Visible Church of God on Earth*. There is also a "Synoptic Review" of each essay and, lastly, a detailed index. The first two works of Dr. Walther are presented with more illustrative material than

is the last, of which hardly more is offered than the bare theses. But even so the book gives the reader an excellent idea of what Dr. Walther taught on the various subjects in question. Whether the volume will sell or not depends largely on our pastors and teachers and their interest in the questions which it discusses. If the topics which it presents are properly set forth in our voters' and other meetings and, besides, are studied in our advanced instruction classes in school and Sunday-school, the book will prove itself a great blessing to our Church. Then, too, we shall rightly observe the centennial of the coming of our Pilgrim Fathers, not outwardly merely, by means of festive services, but inwardly and truly, by putting to practise the important truths which our pious Fathers have taught us from God's Word.

J. THEODORE MUELLER

I Believe. Addresses on the Apostles' Creed. By Howard W. Ferrin. Fleming H. Revell Co., New York, N. Y. 174 pages, 5×7. Price, \$1.50. Order through Concordia Publishing House, 3558 S. Jefferson Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

Howard W. Ferrin is president of the Providence Bible Institute, Providence, R. I. His book, now in its second printing, was written in defense of the orthodox faith. He expresses his theme in a well-written foreword in these words: "Christ and His redemption, and not metaphysics, furnish the one unifying principle to all life, thought, and action." His division of the *Apostolicum* for the purpose of detailed discussion is in twenty chapters, each of which covers a fundamental doctrine of the faith. His treatment is scholarly, yet popular enough for the layman, the language is excellent, the illustrations are to the point. All in all, it is a splendid testimony to the Christian faith, and one will find comparatively few points in which one must disagree with the author. Certainly, one can only hope that the author will accomplish through a wide distribution of his book what he states in these words:

"We hear much in these days about the reconstruction or modernization of Christian theology. While we may and do admit that the garb of truth will inevitably change from generation to generation, we hold that the truth itself remains the same. We also hold that the language of the Apostles' Creed expresses, in words that can be understood by all, the great verities of the Word of God, which are essential to an intelligent understanding of the Christian faith. Therefore we feel that a reaffirmation of our belief in these cardinal truths at this time will help to settle many whose minds have been disturbed by erroneous religious teaching, perplexing philosophy, and science falsely so called."

W. G. POLACK

Christ in His Suffering. By K. Schilder. Translated from the Dutch by Henry Zylstra. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. 1937. 467 pages, 6×8¼. Price, \$3.00.

Having first been issued in the Netherlands in 1929, this book, so the publishers say, earned for its author a phenomenal reputation. Dr. Schilder, a graduate of the University of Erlangen, was elected by the General Synod of his Church (Reformed) as professor of Ethics and Dogmatics in Kampen, Holland, a position he still holds. The work before us consists of sermonic essays or meditations on the Passion of our Lord

and is praised as being "distinguished by flashing exegetical insight, a wealth of reflection, and a host of richly provocative suggestions." It must be admitted that the author writes in a forceful, searching, way, avoiding what is hackneyed and platitudinous. What he submits rests on deep and reverent meditation. The underlying theology naturally is that of the Calvinistic churches. Reading the chapter on the institution of the Lord's Supper, one sees not only his adherence to the Reformed view of the Sacrament, but the discussion of the manner in which the Sacrament was given is typically Reformed, inasmuch as the Nestorian tendency of Calvinism to separate the two natures of Christ is in evidence. The founding of the Sacrament is explained as originating in the Messianic consciousness of Jesus. (P. 234.) While the Sacraments of the Old Testament, so the author says, were instituted by direct command of God, by a voice from heaven, as it were, here "no voice is necessary. Christ is so permeated with the Messianic consciousness that He acts on the basis of infallible certainty as He takes the bread from the table and, by blessing it, segregates it from any other bread in the world. And He takes the wine from the table, pronounces thanks over the cup, and in that way lifts that wine out of all other liquors of the world. Thus He accepts bread and wine as the means which God Himself allows Him to use, so revealing Himself as the Messiah, who knows unhesitatingly what He may do." A Lutheran theologian loyal to the Confessions of his Church would have written differently on this point. He would have said that the Man Jesus instituting the Sacrament is the true God and that hence we have as direct a divine origin for the Sacrament of the Altar as Israel had for Circumcision and the Passover.

In conclusion, to characterize this work properly, it must be added that here we have the first one of three books on the suffering of Christ. What is treated in this volume is the account of the suffering of Jesus up to, and including, His being made a captive in the Garden of Gethsemane.

W. ARNDT

American Lutheranism Surrenders to Forces of Conservatism. A thesis submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the University of Minnesota by Carl Mauelshagen, university system of Georgia, Atlanta, in partial fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. Planographed. 252 pages, 6×3½. For particulars address Dr. Carl Mauelshagen, 1830 Peachtree Road, Atlanta, Ga.

If we review this expanded doctor's thesis at this place, it is to bring to the attention of our readers what we regard as a most timely contribution to our present Saxon Centennial literature. Dr. Mauelshagen was connected with the university system of Georgia, his home being in Atlanta. His thesis was submitted to, and accepted by, the Graduate Faculty of the University of Minnesota and was published in its present form in 1936. In his Foreword the author writes: "The subject-matter of the monograph proved of such general interest that a departure from the usual structure of a doctor's dissertation seemed advisable. The manner in which the outstanding leaders of the Lutheran Church in America and Germany are involved in the story convinced

me that it is a subject which should interest the general reader as well as one interested in church history. With this in mind, I have attempted to present the material in its historical setting by tracing the interplay of religious and cultural forces in America and Europe with their repercussions among Lutherans in the Old and New World." We believe that the writer has accomplished his purpose very well. He has done extensive reading in the special field here treated, as the long list of illustrative footnotes and the abundant bibliography, which evidently he has studied with great care, strikingly show. The work is thorough and scholarly and covers in its fourteen chapters the following topics: Reasons for German Immigration 1820—1860; Germany from Despair and Materialism to Spiritual and National Regeneration; Early American Lutheranism to 1850; The Spiritual Status of the Lutherans in the West; Germany Awakens to America's Spiritual Need; The Saxon and Prussian Lutherans; Awakening of Confessional Consciousness within Lutheran Ranks in the United States; The Missouri Synod — Its Organization and Polity; The Cohesive Forces in the Missouri Synod; The Conflict within "Old Lutheran" Ranks — "Buffalo" vs. "Missouri"; The Missouri Synod and Its German Implications; The Scandinavian and German Lutherans; The General Synod Succumbs to Conservative Lutheranism; Retrospect of the Missouri Synod. To these chapters the author has added a Conclusion, in which he recapitulates his finds and contemplates the future. The present reviewer was unable to examine each statement as to its historical verity, but upon the whole the presentation of historic trends and developments is accurate and truthful. In connection with Mauelshagen's monograph Dr. Bente's two volumes on *American Lutheranism* may be studied with excellent profit.

J. THEODORE MUELLER

Sabbath and Immersion. By O. Boettcher. Concordia Publishing House. Tract No. 98. 24 pages, 5×7¼. Price: Single copy, 10 cts., postpaid; dozen, 96 cts., and postage.

This tract is a reprint of a series of articles which appeared in the *Lutheran Witness* fourteen years ago. The material is as up-to-date now as it was then. In convincing paragraphs Pastor Boettcher shows that the position of the Seventh-day Adventists is untenable. Over against the various immersionists, the antipedobaptists, the Pentecostals and their baptism with the Holy Spirit, the author marshals Scripture with telling force. This tract will be welcomed by those pastors especially whose people are being troubled by any of the groups treated in the tract. The tract deserves a prominent place in the tract-rack of every congregation.

F. E. MAYER

Führen die Weltkirchenkonferenzen nach Canterbury? Von W. Sch. Verlag des Schriftenvereins (E. Klärner), Zwickau, Sachsen. 44 Seiten 5½×9. Preis: Kartoniert, 60 Pf.

Dies ist „ein Augenzeugenbericht über die Oxfordter Weltkonferenz (1938) mit neuem, hochaktuellem Material“. P. Sch. (London) weist erstens nach, daß die Weltkonferenzen alle nichtrömischen Kirchen zu einer Kirche vereinigen wollen; unter gewissen Bedingungen könnte diese Weltkirche auch die römische Kirche in sich aufnehmen. „D. Temple, der Erzbischof von York, sagte ganz offen: „Die nichtrömische Christenheit muß durch einen einzigen Mund zur Welt reden kön-

nen.' Und „der Erzbischof von Canterbury erklärte in Oxford, daß die über-
ragende Bedeutung der Kirche Christi in einer ruhelosen Welt wieder zum Durch-
bruch komme. Darum Sammlung aller Christen der Erde, nicht unter Verzicht
auf ihre Sondergaben und -bekenntnisse, aber mit kraftvoller Herausstellung, daß
es noch eine große Christenheit auf Erden gibt, geeint unter dem Zepter Christi!
Dann wird auch die Welt auf sie hören, und die Staaten werden auf sie hören.“
Zweitens wird nachgewiesen, daß die Leiter dieser Bewegung die Aufgabe der zu-
künftigen Weltkirche darin sehen, daß sie durch das Evangelium (durch ihr Evan-
gelium) eine Weltverbesserung, Reformen auf dem politischen und sozialen Gebiet
herbeiführe. „Die Grundthesen der ganzen Oxford, ja der ganzen ötumeni-
schen Bewegung sind nach dem offiziellen Bericht der Oxford Konferenz (*The
Churches Survey Their Task*, S. 99 und 227): Nur um das Evangelium
herum, das heißt, in der Kirche kann das Volk sich wirklich einigen, und um
diesen Mittelpunkt herum kann allein Völkergemeinschaft entstehen. Also bieten
sich diese Kirchen zu dieser irdischen Aufgabe an, und zwar 1. jedem Volk und
2. der Völkergemeinschaft.“ Das Ziel ist, wie es Prof. Vater bei einer andern
Gelegenheit ausdrückte, „to Christianize nationalism, to nationalize Chris-
tianity, to Christianize internationalism, to internationalize Christianity“.
(S. 32.) Diesen Leuten geht es nicht um das Evangelium. Es geht ihnen viel-
mehr darum, die Welt mit weltlichen Mitteln zu verbessern, sie gesetzig zu refor-
mieren, die europäisch-amerikanische Kultur auf diesem Wege zu erneuern.“ (S. 20.)
Wenn es im Vorwort heißt: „Die beiden Tagungen [Oxford und Edinburgh]
dienten der Erfüllung des Traumes, alle nichtrömischen Weltkirchen zur Unter-
mauerung der englischen Weltmachstellung zu benutzen“, so ent-
halten wir uns darüber eines Urteils. Aber das ist gewiß, diese Weltkonferenzen
liegen unter dem Bann des calvinistischen Wahnes, daß eine Hauptauf-
gabe der Kirche auf politischem Gebiet liegt. So gibt Canterbury, eine Haupt-
stadt des Calvinismus, auf alle Fälle den Ton an. — Manche Ausdrücke in dieser
trefflichen Schrift hätten etwas gemäßigter sein können.

Wir machen nebenbei auf die diesem Heft angefügte Bücheranzeige auf-
merksam. Es wird uns alle interessieren, daß der Schriftenverein (E. Klärner)
diese beiden Schriften anzeigt: Die rechte Gestalt einer vom Staate
unabhängigen ev.-luth. Ortsgemeinde. Dargestellt von D. C. F.
W. Walther. Preis: Broschiert, RM. 1.50. — Die Kirche frei vom
Staate. Sechshundsechzig Leitsätze mit biblischen Beweisstellen, entnommen aus
D. C. F. W. Walthers Referat „Die rechte Gestalt usw.“ Mit einem Vorwort von
D. Otto Willkomm. Preis: Broschiert, 60 Pf. Th. Engelder

Der Kampf der deutschen lutherischen Freikirchen im 19. Jahrhundert. Von
Heinrich Martin. Chr.-Kaiser-Verlag, München. 1937. 68 Seiten.
Preis: RM. 1.50.

Dies Büchlein ist Heft 56/57 der Schriftenreihe „Bekennende Kirche“, in Ge-
meinschaft mit Georg Merz und Hermann Sasse herausgegeben von Christian Soll.
Der Verfasser beschreibt den Anfang der evangelisch-lutherischen Freikirchen in
Preußen und Hessen durch den Kampf gegen die Union von 1817, den in Schlesien
besonders Johann Gottfried Scheibel, Professor der Theologie an der Universität
Breslau, und mit ihm die beiden Universitätsprofessoren Hushke und Steffens
führten, während in Hessen August Wilmar, Professor der Theologie in Mar-
burg, und sein jüngerer Bruder, Wilhelm Wilmar, Metropolit in Melsungen,
die Rentitenen leiteten.

Theo. Höger

Research Memorandum on Religion in the Depression. By Samuel C. Kincheloe. Social Science Research Council, 230 Park Ave., New York, N. Y. 158 pages, 6×9. Price, \$1.00. May be ordered through Concordia Publishing House, 3558 S. Jefferson Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

This book is worthy of the most careful study, since it presents the results of a study which was planned and carried out with scientific thoroughness. It will give pastors who are trying to evaluate the new social movements of our day with reference to the Church abundant material for meditation and for action. The author, who is Associate Professor of the Sociology of Religion at the Chicago Theological Seminary, offers the following chapters: Church-membership and Attendance; Church Finances; The Clergy; Secularization: General Considerations; The Message; Program and Activities. We find a number of pertinent remarks concerning the Lutheran groups, including the Missouri Synod. Some of the author's conclusions are challenging, if not always fully convincing, and one is tempted to quote at length from some of the sections, especially under the heading "Secularization," where we find the following sentence, for example: "Even before the depression missionary funds had begun to decrease, the church-school enrolment had decreased, and churches seemed to be having difficulty in securing attendance." (P. 51.) We recommend this book to all pastors who are trying to understand the changes which have influenced church-life during the last twenty years.

P. E. KRETZMANN

Facts that Undergird Life. By Paul E. Scherer. Harper & Brothers, publishers, New York and London. 181 pages, 5¼×7¾. Price, \$1.50.

The preacher of these so-called sermons is a pastor of the United Lutheran Church and is known to a larger audience by his radio broadcasts. We have tried hard to find in these messages a clear Scriptural presentation of how the sinner is saved, but we have failed to find it. In reference to the outstanding fundamentals of the Christian religion the speaker is evasive, at least not clear. A sample from his "sermon" on "The Mysteries of the Cross" is herewith given:

"But not only is sin persistent in spite of the way in which we try to ignore it; it's dreadful. People doctor it up and make plays out of it for an evening's amusement. They put good clothes on it and write a novel in which, as Channing Pollock has pointed out, it's smart to be dirty and cynical and disregardful of everything upon which every decent civilization has to be founded and by means of which this civilization of ours must endure, if it does endure.

"Even you and I frequently enough regard the whole thing with precious little concern. We condone it in ourselves and sometimes shake our heads with secret admiration for the men and women who seem to get away with it, as we say, in the grand manner: who covet largely and cheat broadly and murder magnificently in armies! While by reason of it all, what we call society is crumbling in front of our eyes. It's the only thing in the whole wide world that makes our going difficult. People who spend their time being afraid of disease and poverty and loneliness and pain are 'fools and blind' to pass sin by with nothing but

a shrug. When a man once really sees how life is, he'll get down on his knees and make a prayer of that cry: 'God in heaven, will nobody say anything?'

"The mystery of it is that two thousand years ago one Man did say something by dying; and there's still nothing else to be said. The night before, in Gethsemane, He trembled; and it wasn't at death. Of that I'm sure. He was no coward, less brave than the women and children who have since died for Him. It isn't human weakness you stumble on in the prayer He prayed, 'Father, if it be Thy will, let this cup pass from me,' and in the sweat that was like great drops of blood. That's not the slack in the fiber of a man's courage: that's the tautness in God's face staring without any veil into the abyss of human sin; it's the tortured knowledge of God standing on the brink of its own appalling leap to get under the farthest estate to which any soul can fall, as the eagle is said to dart with the swiftness of the wind to spread her wings beneath her fledgling when it drops; 'Father, if it be Thy will,' and then to walk off, with eyes wide open as He did, into the yawning mouth of the Thing!

"That's one of the mysteries of the cross, that in some unaccountable way it has got itself related to the eternal, caustic, mordant mystery, for all our attempts to gloss it over, of human sin. And it brings me to another: that in some fashion, equally unaccountable, it has got itself related to the eternal, triumphant mystery of human assurance in the face of that sin. I do not know how it happened, and no one else does. The theories about it have never satisfied anybody very long. It's the fact that interests and concerns me. And that fact, simply stated, is just this: that the only complete and final answer to the riddle of lust and greed and selfishness and injustice and cruelty which life has ever discovered it has found on Calvary. Nowhere else have men learned to stand as straight and look so steadily into those evil eyes with as little terror." (Pp. 171, 172.) The reader of these words asks, What does the preacher really teach concerning Christ's death on the cross?

Speaking on the text 2 Cor. 13:14, the preacher says: "I offer no apology for attempting to set before you the three basic conceptions which have upheld now for twenty centuries the life of the Christian community. Paul records them in the so-called New Testament benediction, which is a sort of threefold idea of God held in solution, not crystallized yet into any doctrine, with no effort at definition, just the bare statement of an experience which any man may have of the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ and the love of God and the communion of the Holy Ghost; not an abstruse philosophy, out of touch with life; not simply a revelation, to be received on the authority of a book and recited in a creed,—but an insight, an insight into the nature of that ultimate reality which undergirds the universe; a judgment of essential values—values inherent in the very process of living, values without which life cannot continue long or prove valiant and victorious. This that we call today the doctrine of the Trinity is really just a home-body bit of philosophy in its overalls. I want you to watch it at work." (P. 30.)

In the concluding paragraph on this text the preacher gives this summary: "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost." I wonder if you see any more

clearly now how that ancient doctrine of the Trinity, because it was first an experience, still conserves and interprets the most immediately valuable of all the truths that undergird our life: faith through Christ in the human soul; our belief in a friendly world held fast in a Father's love; and this knowledge, which no failure can ever betray, that you and I may turn back now into the thick of things, and even if the vision tarry, we can wait for it there with quiet eyes, for it will come; and it will not be late!" (P. 35.)

Whatever these so-called sermons may be, they certainly do not clearly present the Scriptural way to salvation. It makes one feel sad to know that they have been delivered at all, and especially, that they have been published by means of the radio to people so sadly in need of the old Gospel — and here they do not get it. J. H. C. FRITZ

Cross and Affliction. By R. C. Rein. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. 64 pages, $5\frac{1}{4} \times 7\frac{1}{2}$. Paper cover. Price, 25 cts.

We gladly recommend this booklet to all our pastors for their own personal use in troublous times and for preparation for sick-calls and other pastoral visits. We ought to place this book into all homes within our Synod. It offers twenty-six meditations, ten on "The Christian's Cross," sixteen on "The Christian's Affliction." A number of suitable prayers and Scripture-readings are added. TH. LAETSCH

Wives of the Bible. By W. B. Riley. Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich. 119 pages, $5 \times 7\frac{3}{4}$. Price, \$1.00.

Their Names Remain. Seventeen Women of Old Testament Days. By Mary Hallet. The Abingdon Press. New York. 132 pages, $4\frac{1}{4} \times 6\frac{3}{4}$. Price, 75 cts.

The reader may find some fine thoughts, penetrating delineations of character, and practical applications in these two books. Riley bases Christian character on faith in the atoning work of the Son of God. Miss Hallet knows of no such foundation. The story of creation is to her a myth, Eve's life "veiled in legends and symbolism," Sarah "appears to us as the first unquestionably historical woman of the Hebrews," p. 19. Riley's book, in the opinion of the reviewer, is marred by too many stories, and both authors become guilty of frequently reading too much into the Biblical records rather than being satisfied with expounding the story as it is found in the Bible. Interpretation consists in letting the facts speak, not one's own imagination. TH. LAETSCH

A Virtuous Woman. By Oscar Lowry. Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich. 160 pages, $5\frac{1}{4} \times 7\frac{1}{2}$. Price, \$1.00.

Pastor Lowry writes on sex life in relation to the Christian life, warning against the pitfalls of modern society, its immoralities and impurities. Many of his stories would gain in value if they were not so vague as to time and place. Unfortunately he places the use of tobacco and intoxicating drinks in the list of sinful things to be avoided by Christians. Still we can recommend the book as a sane exposition of the problem of sex life. TH. LAETSCH

Proceedings of the Thirty-Sixth Convention of the Ev. Luth. Synodical Conference of North America. 1938. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. Price, 25 cts.

We have here two timely and instructive essays, written with a great expenditure of time, thought, and care, such as the importance of the subjects demands. "Union Movements in the Church," by Professor Hoyer, covers the various attempts made within the Church to unite the various dissenting parties, some of which attempts were God-pleasing and therefore successful, most of which, however, were carried on in the unionistic spirit and therefore disastrous in their results. The last section of the essay (the first part of which was presented in 1936) treats of the "Union Movements in the Lutheran Church in America." The essay concludes with two warnings: "There is, on the one hand, the danger of establishing a union without true unity. . . . History shows us that true Lutheranism simply cannot exist in an atmosphere of doctrinal indifference. . . . Luther: 'Verflucht sei die Liebe und Eintracht, wegen deren Gottes Wort darangegeben wird, um sie zu erhalten.' (IX, p. 555.)" "There is danger of assuming another attitude, that of standing so straight that we lean over backward. Let us not give just cause for the accusation that we are deliberately separatistic, that we refuse to unite with others because we want to be different. . . . Luther said: 'It is indeed true that we ought to have patience even though everything in doctrine be not realized at once (as this has not occurred even among us),' " (XVII, p. 282.) — The second essay, "Social Problems and the Gospel," by Professor Kowalke, sheds light on a matter concerning which there is much confusion of thought among churchmen, perhaps among us, too. On the one hand, "those efforts that would turn the Gospel of Christ into a social program devoted to the correction of social evils and that would persuade men that the kingdom of heaven consists in a solution of social problems, are, according to Christ Himself, conceived by the devil and are an offense unto Him. . . . The kingdom of heaven that He proclaimed was something quite different from the bread-and-fish paradise dreamed of by men." On the other hand, "the Gospel does touch the social problems and does solve them in its own way — by making new creatures of men who shall live before God in righteousness and who by their lives as children of God refrain from creating conditions of life that others might suffer from, and who patiently bear whatever cross of social problems God sees fit to impose. . . . Thirdly, we know that God withholds that consuming wrath only because of those sinners who have been washed by the blood of the Lamb or who are yet to come to the knowledge of Christ through the preaching of the Gospel."

TH. ENGELDER

Lutheran School Journal. Edited by the Faculty of Concordia Teachers College, River Forest, Ill., with the Cooperation of Representatives from the Field. Published monthly, September to June. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. Terms: \$1.50 per annum anywhere in the world.

Our *Lutheran School Journal*, formerly *Schulblatt*, should hardly require a special notice of this kind. In a former generation it was

practically self-evident that a pastor subscribed not only for the professional magazines in his own field (*Lehre und Wehre*, *Homiletisches Magazin*, *Theological Quarterly*, later the *Theological Monthly*), but also the professional magazine for teachers, since he must be concerned about the matter of schools and teaching for himself and in order to understand the work of the parish-school. The *School Journal* in its new form not only invites but practically compels every pastor who is interested in the entire field of teaching (and which pastor can afford not to be?) to subscribe for, and study, this well-edited magazine. Its scope has been so broadened as to offer all professional people a fine opportunity to remain abreast of the times. The Editorial Section, the articles, the Music Department, the reviews, — all hold a definite appeal and should attract and hold readers.

P. E. KRETZMANN

Recreation in Church and Community. Edited by Warren T. Powell. The Abingdon Press. 136 pages, $4\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{3}{4}$. Price, 75 cts.

The subtitle of this little book is "The Values and Theory of Play, Its Influence upon Character, Its Objectives and Programs." This ambitious title is satisfied in the discussion, much of which is taken from Charles D. Giauque, Raymond W. Porter, and H. D. Edgren, and shows a careful study of the principles involved. A few sections will not have much value for the Lutheran pastor, and we definitely disagree with the author when he suggests at least one sermon a year on recreation. But the book contains so many excellent suggestions that it is well worth studying. The paragraphs on the objectives of recreation (p. 55 f.), on the characteristics of various age levels (pp. 61—64), the hints for picnic contests (p. 92 f.), the suggestions on discipline (p. 115), and the bibliography are alone worth the price of the book.

P. E. KRETZMANN

BOOKS RECEIVED

From M. A. Donohue & Co., Chicago and New York:

Addresses. By Henry Drummond. 363 pages. Price, 75 cts.

Stepping Heavenward. By Mrs. C. Prentiss. 359 pages. Price, 75 cts.

Kept for the Master's Use. By Frances Havergal. 159 pages. Price, 75 cts.

With Christ in the School of Prayer. By Andrew Murray. 307 pages. Price, 75 cts.

From the United Lutheran Publication House, Philadelphia, Pa.:

Green Timber. By Esther Gerberding Hunt. 220 pages, $5\frac{1}{4} \times 7\frac{3}{4}$. Price, 75 cts.

From Concordia Publishing House:

My Redeemer. An Easter Evening Service for Congregation and Children. By A. C. Mueller. 14 pages, 6×9 . Price, 5 cts.

From the Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Mich.:

When God Died. A series of meditations for Lent, including descriptive messages on the Seven Sayings on the Cross. By Herbert Lockyer, D. D. 118 pages, $5 \times 7\frac{1}{2}$. Price, \$1.00.

From Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich.:

These Men Live! Candid-camera Bible Characters. By William Ward Ayer, D. D. 135 pages, 5×7½. Price, \$1.00.

Let the Fire Fall. By Paul W. Rood. 131 pages. Price, \$1.00.

All the Days. By Clark J. Forcey. 163 pages, 5¼×7½. Price, \$1.00.

The Christ We Need. Fifteen sermons. By W. T. Conner, Professor of Systematic Theology, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary. 124 pages, 5×7½. Price, \$1.00.

From the Stockton Press, 516 N. Charles St., Baltimore, Maryland:

1,000 More Snappy Sentences for Church Bulletin Boards. Compiled by Rev. Paul E. Holdcraft, D. D., S. T. D. 54 pages. Price, 35 cts.

From the Abingdon Press, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago:

The Fulfilment. An Easter Choralogue. For Use in the Churches. Arranged for Reader, Organ, and Choir. By Oswald W. S. McCall. 15 pages. Price, 35 cts.

From the Methodist Book Concern, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago:

Income, Outgo, and the Kingdom of God. A Study in Personal and Family Economics. By Samuel E. Carruth. 62 pages. Price, 25 cts.

Living and Working in Our Country. A Unit in Week-day Religious Education for Christian Citizenship Series for Grades Five and Six. By Edna M. Baxter. 199 pages, 5½×8½. Price, \$1.00.

From Meador Publishing Company, Boston, Mass.:

From Son-Lit Shores. By James Falk. 200 pages. Price, \$2.00.

The Last Struggle. By Rev. J. Kromolicki. 182 pages. Price, \$1.50.

From the Judson Press, Chicago, Los Angeles, Kansas City, Seattle, Philadelphia:

Yet We Can Hope. By Lee A. Howe, Jr. 156 pages. Price, \$1.50.

NOTICE TO OUR SUBSCRIBERS

In order to render satisfactory service, we must have our current mailing-list correct. The expense of maintaining this list has been materially increased. Under present regulations we are subject to a "fine" on all parcels mailed to an incorrect address, inasmuch as we must pay 2 cents for every notification sent by the postmaster on a parcel or periodical which is undeliverable because no forwarding address is available or because there has been a change of address. This may seem insignificant, but in view of the fact that we have subscribers getting three or more of our periodicals and considering our large aggregate subscription list, it may readily be seen that it amounts to quite a sum during a year; for the postmaster will address a notification to each individual periodical. Our subscribers can help us by notifying us — one notification (postal card, costing only 1 cent) will take care of the addresses for several publications. We shall be very grateful for your cooperation.

Kindly consult the address label on this paper to ascertain whether your subscription has expired or will soon expire. "Apr 39" on the label means that your subscription has expired. Please pay your agent or the Publisher promptly in order to avoid interruption of service. It takes about two weeks before the address label can show change of address or acknowledgment of remittance.

When paying your subscription, please mention name of publication desired and exact name and address (both old and new, if change of address is requested).

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE, St. Louis, Mo.